THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Lord's Prayer has been all along a favourite subject with the Christian expositor. So much so that one does not turn excitedly or with great expectancy to a new exposition. But it is at least interesting to come across an exposition under the name of Mr. Gerald HEARD; and a perusal of the volume leaves one with the impression that here is something at once unusual and challenging.

The Creed of Christ (Cassell; 6s. net) professes to be an 'interpretation' of the Lord's Prayer; and 'interpretation' is in this case a more fitting word than 'exposition,' if it be understood that in interpretation more should be allowed to the subjective factor. The interpretation which is here offered may be described in brief as a reading of the various clauses of the Lord's Prayer in the light of mystical religion.

The author of this book looks upon Christ as the prototype of a new and higher humanity, in which the relation of men to God is describable as that of Sons, not of Friends, much less of Servants. It is through mystical fellowship with God in Christ that this relation and state may be attained. As those who know the author's other writings would anticipate, this position is expounded with striking eloquence and by the frequent aid of scientific instance.

We shall not attempt to analyse the contents of the book, in which the attempt is made—to use Mr. HEARD's language—to decode and apply the fivefold formula of the signature prayer. But a few selected quotations will serve to give an impression of the contents. Referring to the petition, 'Hallowed be thy name,' he says characteristically, 'That first clause tells us the key in which this prayer is to be prayed; it is an indication of the carrying-wave in which any message from time to eternity must be transmitted.'

Here is another characteristic reference, this time to the prayer as a whole: 'Not only is every clause fraught with intense meaning, but the meaning of the whole is so vital that the very order of the clauses is in itself intensely important and revealing. . . . Indeed, the whole prayer is such a living, germinal force that we may rightly compare its structure to what to-day we know about that other basic germinal force, the chromosome rod which lies in the centre of each life-bearing seed and which carries in it the precise potentialities of the full-grown plant or animal. We now know about the chromosomes that they carry in themselves a series of nodes or clauses—the genes—each one of which is a packet of some vital characteristic that will appear fully manifest in the developed creature which springs from the seed; and we know also that, not only is each of these genes vitally important, but the very order which they occupy in the chromosome rod is itself important and profoundly affects how they will manifest themselves in the full-grown creature.'

Here is a topical reference, exaggerated as it may be and perhaps even being falsified by events: 'The world, at this hour, is being driven to destruction by men of incalculable dynamic energy and will, men whose absolute control of their fellows' wills, energies, and imaginations is so hypnotic that such an ascendancy would have been unbelievable to our grandparents. . . . As we can find no social-worker class of equal intensity with, and so equal to salvage, our criminal class, even less can we find a leader of free men equal in appeal and singleness of aim to the dictators. Beside them and their picked apostolate our pale good fellowship of amiable half-time interest shrinks like a pouter pigeon before a condor.'

We conclude with a quotation which shows the author's interest in mystical religion, in which he discovers the successive grades of Servants, Friends, and Sons: 'Such is the sheer ascent, the precipitous rise to which life points us. But religion replies, though precipitous, it can be scaled, and so only the individual finds his Eternal Life. This climb is then the mountain of the mystics. First purgation, with the deliverance from sin, but no power yet to salvage others. Then illumination, with deliverance from self, and power to let the Light stream through into the darkness of others' spirits. And finally union, with deliverance from all separation, the rising to sonship with full power on earth to forgive sins. Such we may be if we wish; such only can to-day redeem the world.'

'In conclusion, I believe that Barthianism and Modernism are coming closer together in an alliance against a materialistic and tyrannical atheism': that is the closing sentence of a rather startling article in *The Modern Churchman* of May this year. The article is by the Rev. D. E. H. WHITELEY, M.A., and its title 'Is English Modernism out of Date?'

Mr. WHITELEY assumes two beliefs as the essence of Modernism. The first is that in the New Testament we can find a fundamentally reliable account of the mission and message of Jesus, who was God's unique self-revelation to the world under human limitations. The English Modernist does not feel himself archaic when in this matter he takes his stand with Vincent Taylor, Easton, and Streeter, rather than with Bultmann and Guiguebert.

The second belief is that 'even in his fall man cannot destroy the image of God within him; he only obscures it' (quoted from 'The Wisdom of God' by Fr. S. Bulgakov). From this it follows that there is no chasm between Nature and Grace, or between Reason and Revelation. (But is not this a Catholic contention? Even, indeed, a *Roman* Catholic contention? However, Mr. WHITELEY'S point is that those who are classified as 'Barthians' all in varying degrees deny this belief.)

Now, Karl Barth was at first a theological Liberal. He describes in 'The Word of God and the Word of Man' how he became disillusioned with Liberalism and took refuge in a traditionalism based on the Bible seen through spectacles, the lenses of which were Luther and Calvin. But Barth, knowing that he could not destroy the Maginot Line of Biblical Criticism by direct assault, went round it. He admits the fallibility of the Bible: 'No human word, no word of Paul, is absolute Truth.' In 'The Doctrine of the Word of God,' he writes: 'Why, and in what respect, does the Biblical witness possess authority? In that it claims no authority whatsoever for itself, that its witness amounts to letting the Something else be the authority, itself and by its own agency.'

Here the English Modernist and Barth are in fundamental agreement. No English Modernist thinks that the uses of textual, higher and historical criticism are sufficient of themselves for the fruitful study of the Scriptures. He must also bring to their study the desire to secure moral and spiritual truth; and to do that he knows that he needs in his own heart the illuminating presence of the Holy Spirit. The Barthian, in distinguishing

between the letter of Scripture and the Divine Revelation which is mediated through that letter, stands precisely where the English Modernist stands, who refuses to identify Scripture with the Word of God, but has always affirmed that Scripture contains the Word of God.

The same agreement is shared in regard to the Creeds. 'Results of dogmatic work,' Barth writes, 'like dogmas underlying the Creeds which are venerable results, because gained in the common knowledge of the Church at a definite time, may and should guide our own dogmatic work, but never replace it at any point in virtue of their authority.' And Brunner says of the Creeds: 'They are not objects of faith; they are expressions of faith.' These are the men, says Mr. WHITELEY, who are supposed to have superseded Modernism. They have not superseded it; they have confirmed it.

Even in regard to human reason there is surprising unity. Barth was at one time anti-intellectual, for he wrote: 'Faith grips reason by the throat and strangles the beast.' But he has since recanted, for he criticises Brunner's design of smashing the axiom of reason and declares that 'the word of God . . . is a rational and not an irrational event.' And in his latest major work (Gifford Lectures) he says: 'It is high time that the anti-intellectualism, which has reigned so long in the Church, should disappear finally.'

So far Barth has been merely echoing Modernism in a different language, but there is one great bone of contention between English Modernism and Barth. He believes that man's salvation is the work of God exclusively. He also says: 'I am an avowed opponent of all Natural Theology.' These views go hand in hand. We all grant that man cannot attain salvation without God's help, but if God is solely responsible for the salvation of one man, He is also solely responsible for the damnation of another man. And to say that is to speak blasphemy.

This is the only major disagreement between Barthianism and Modernism, and on this point Modernism can await the verdict of the future with no misgivings. It may be asked, then, why Barthianism and Modernism are held to be antitheses. The reasons are: (1) Barth criticises with great violence German Liberal Protestantism, which is not the same as English Modernism. (2) In quarrelling with Liberal Protestantism, Barth, as often happens in quarrels, expresses himself with a bitterness which he has since regretted, and this has given rise to wrong impressions. And (3) not a few of Barth's less understanding followers have emphasized mainly what is negative, abusive, and hysterical in Barth's writings. This also has created still further misunderstandings, since Barth has disavowed a number of his earlier and more extreme utterances.

Is it possible, or probable, that something like an eirenicon in theology is on the way? that the pendulum which swung to the side of humanism, and then to the side of supernaturalism, is coming to a middle point? It is what has happened all through history. One age asserts one side of truth; the next age asserts the opposite; and then comes a happy age that sees the half-truth in each and puts them together. The utter failure of humanism, in and by itself, is being exposed in the tragedy of the present. But we shall have to carry the truth in it with us into any new construction, and apparently the best type of humanist is realizing that in the end the Divine factor is dominant.

The problem of human suffering is always with us and has now been greatly intensified by the war. There must be many to-day to whom the problem has now for the first time become suddenly acute and very personal, and these stand in much need of spiritual help and guidance.

In these circumstances any competent treatment of the subject is to be welcomed. And accordingly we warmly commend *God and Human Suffering*, by the Rev. R. H. L. SLATER, M.A. (Epworth Press; 5s. net). Mr. SLATER, a former scholar of Jesus

College, Cambridge, writes from a Burmese frontier station to those 'whose faith in Almighty God has been shaken by the suffering of this present time.' He has thought long and deeply on the subject and has many suggestions of value to offer.

We approach the problem as Christians, and it is for Christians that the problem becomes most acute. 'As Christians we believe in the divine goodness. God is love. We see Him in the face of Jesus Christ, and we believe that He has for all mankind a fully beneficent purpose. He plans and intends their well-being. It is inconceivable that He could purpose their hurt. He can neither plan nor think evil. And because He is God, He is almighty. He can fulfil His purpose. He created the universe and He controls it.' How in the face of this can we account for the evils and sufferings that so greatly abound? The stern facts of life seem to give the lie direct to our Christian faith, leading many to renounce that faith while others hold on to it with fear and difficulty.

Now it is highly important to observe that the conflict is between our conceptions of the facts and not necessarily the facts themselves. That is to say, we have certain beliefs about the character and purpose of God, and we have certain impressions of the manifold evils in the world. It is these beliefs and these impressions which are in conflict. The question then naturally arises whether these ideas of ours in regard to God and evil truly represent the fact or whether we may not be under some personal misconceptions which would disappear in the light of fuller knowledge. 'The problem may read differently if we change our conceptions of divine love and power, and revise our estimate of those things and events which we have dismissed as evil.'

Before we break out and say, 'I cannot believe in God when there is so much innocent suffering in the world,' we need to examine and it may be revise the articles of our faith. What kind of a God do we believe in, and what do we expect Him to do? As soon as we look into these questions we begin to discover that we harbour many misconceptions and cherish many unwarranted expectations.

We believe in the goodness and love of God, and rightly so. But how do we conceive that love and goodness? 'We shall find, I think, that most people expect the goodness of God to satisfy their desires and relieve their fears. The good God will give them all the happiness they crave. He will give them this happiness essentially in the form they seek it—wealth, fame, popularity, comfort, ease. Since they fear disturbance, He will not thwart them; He is essentially amiable. In other words our conception of goodness is often very sentimental.' This is a picture of the divine love far removed from that which is given in the gospel and exemplified in Christ. One of the first things to do, therefore, as we approach the problem of suffering, is to revise our conception of the divine love and goodness, changing it for one more in accord with the facts of life, the teaching of the Bible, and the full context of the Christian faith.

There are similar misconceptions in regard to the power of God. It is natural to argue, 'If God is almighty He can do anything. He can answer my prayer, and give me what I want here and now.' But that is really childish. It ignores the fact that even for God some things are impossible. He cannot contradict His own nature. He cannot be good, and not-good. He cannot be good and yet do some of the things His importunate worshippers demand. God has indeed the power as well as the will to help and save, and we do well to trust in Him. Indeed we should trust in Him more confidently and pray to Him more earnestly than we do. But we must be willing that He should help and save in His own time and way, not ours.

We must guard our minds against ideas which are sub-Christian and which cast their shadow upon our faith. 'Nazareth, Calvary, and Pentecost should save us from the torture of the thought that God does not care, or that He is powerless to help.' They remind us that history is not

a record of human suffering without intelligible purpose, unchallenged and unrelieved. On the contrary, it is a record of evil challenged and battled with not by human power alone, and finally made to subserve a divine purpose of good. The evil is there, has been there from the first, so vast and devilish that it can hardly be held to be solely due to human initiative. It cuts to the heart and makes war incessantly on man's well-being in every form. Yet men have held to their faith in God, because they have had proofs and signs indubitable of the goodness and love of God. The very fact that the human mind rebels against evil, and that the human heart is wounded by it, is evidence of a conviction that the universe is essentially a realm of reason and of love.

Our estimate of suffering depends on our estimate of life as a whole, and of what we conceive to be the end of life. 'If we see before man a glorious salvation, an eternal life beyond the grave which attracts the mind and inspires conduct, then a great deal which might otherwise be dismissed as altogether evil will be counted well worth the cost.' There is no doubt that many to-day feel the problem of human suffering to be unbearable for the reason that they regard this present life as all, and count suffering to be dead loss. The death of the young especially is unrelieved tragedy, and therefore the devastations of war make human life seem like 'a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.' But an intelligent faith that can look forward to a heavenly future beyond the grave makes a world of difference, and gives a new meaning to the trials and vicissitudes of this present life.

But when all is said that can be said it remains that we make a frank confession that the presence and prevalence of evil is a mystery, and that in particular we cannot explain human suffering, even with the light of the gospel. At the same time the fact that we do not know why God allows innocent suffering does not mean that we know nothing about God. So many people take for granted that if we are bewildered by the problem of evil we must become agnostics. But God is not wholly unknown, though there be 'clouds and darkness round about Him' in this mysterious world. If there are facts which arouse doubt, are there not also facts which confirm faith? Are there not manifest tokens of God's goodness, and is not His Spirit still at war with sin? We are all apt to regard the problem of suffering from too personal a point of view. If, like the first Christians, we learnt to look on life as a spiritual warfare in which we were called and privileged to fight on the side of God it would lessen the tension, and nerve our hearts to do and to endure. 'If we could regain a vision of the Church as the vehicle of divine activity, if, still more, the Church could become such a convincing, attractive activity that every time we saw it and thought of it, we should exclaim at once, "Surely God is in this place! in this world with all its defeats and suffering, in ceaseless combat against all that is evil"—then, I believe we should think less about the problem of evil and more about the mystery of good.'

Individual Conscience and Social Obligation.

By the Reverend A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., D.Th., London.

As one hears speeches, and reads articles, one sadly misses, and would gladly welcome, more instances of Aristotle's 'golden mean,' or of Hegel's synthesis of antitheses. It is often 'either/or' and seldom 'both.' The *whole* truth is in the fullness and oneness of the *part* truths, which presented as themselves wholes lapse into errors; and what is needed is *organic* and not *atomic* thought. An instance of such atomic thought is often met with in the treatment of the relation of the individual and society, and particularly in the opposition of individual conscience and social obligation. 1. The individual is an empty abstraction apart from his social relations as son, husband, father, worker, citizen, or his position, functions, and vocation as a member of a society of ever-widening range—family, neighbourhood, nation, mankind. Individual fullness and wholeness depends on the unification in the developing personality of the manifold social relations, in which each man finds himself, or which he makes for himself. In our aversion to the error of *totalitarianism*, we must not revert to the *individualism* against which totalitarianism is a reaction, not in itself necessary, but resulting from the extremes of individualism, which failed to recognize that each man is dependent on, and destined for *community*, common interests, activities, and obligations. Against totalitarianism we may assert not *communism*, for that word has acquired a sinister significance, but what may be called *communalism*, into which we are still free to put such content as seems desirable and advisable, in order to secure that the individual shall not be suppressed by the society, but find his own free fulfilment in the acceptance of his social relations, so as to fulfil the common ends of society which, apart from the individuals who are its members, is just as empty an abstraction. The 'golden mean,' the synthesis of the antitheses of individualism and collectivism or socialism, of which communism and totalitarianism alike are violent expressions, lies in *communalism*, which may be expressed in the slogan: 'each for all and all for each.' The word 'community' has come into general use in connexion with the Oxford Conference of 1937 on Church, Community, and State; but it had already been proposed and expounded by Maciver in his book, *Community, a Sociological Study*, as a more adequate description of society than that of the organism which prevailed last century. The conception is, however, much older: it is implicit in practice in society itself if not explicit in theory. We can trace it to the New Testament; scholars will not allow us to render the common word *Koinonia* in the New Testament by community, but in all its uses, to express the common possessions, experiences, and purposes of the primitive Church, the idea is latent, and becoming potent. Those who had so much in common as had the Christian fellowship formed a community, not perfect, yet a pattern worthy of imitation. This communal standpoint as 'golden mean' and 'synthesis' is the starting-point of our consideration of the narrower but focal matter of the relation of individual conscience and social obligation.

2. There are assertions made about the sufficiency and the authority of the individual conscience, which a closer scrutiny of the subject does not warrant; but we begin with the claims which can be fitly made. When the individual is called on to make a choice between what his conscience condemns as wrong, and approves as right, as a moral personality he must obey his conscience as for him then and there final and absolute authority; if he does not obey he sins. Most men have, however they acquired it, a standard of judgment which affords them guidance in most situations which may arise in their ordinary lives. But there may be an emergency in which that standard does not afford certain guidance. Some may try by reflexion to discover which of their moral principles is applicable in view of all the circumstances so far as they know them, and the result of such reflexion which sometimes comes as a self-evidencing intuition becomes an authoritative deliverance of conscience for them. Not confident of their moral sufficiency others may, however, seek counsel of those whose wider knowledge gives assurance of surer judgment. The Confessional, grave as often are its defects, has widely served this purpose. The more complex a society, the more problems of conduct are likely to arise, which will baffle not individual consciences alone, but the whole community affected. There is often need for research to discover all the relevant facts, before there can be effective reflexion or conference. Thus is the

individual conscience made aware of its insufficiency and recognizes not only individual interest, but also social obligations for consultation with others. To-day general advance probably lies on the lines of such conference; but we must recognize that the moral progress of the past has largely depended on individual conscience, the prophet, the reformer, the martyr. One man saw as wrong what society tolerated or approved: or he saw as a duty what was not generally recognized as such. He shared his convictions with others; if he won support he proved a reformer, if not, he might suffer as a martyr. How much ethical reflexion owes to Socrates, and he drank the hemlock! How much does religion as well as morality owe to the Hebrew prophets? Socrates sought the truth by reason, and the exercise of reason is necessary and legitimate. The prophets received the truth by revelation; they were God's confidants, from whom He did not withhold His purpose, but took into His counsel. In the development of moral insight, in which the individual conscience has been so potent a factor, God by His Spirit has been active as Revealer. We are warranted in recognizing in human history a general and a special moral and religious revelation of God 'by divers portions and in diverse manners' as the necessary condition of any progress in the evolution of the race: and the organs of that revelation have been men, illumined in divers measures by the Word of God, the life and the light of men.

3. The Society of Friends, however, seems to go further than the evidence allows us to go, in claiming the inner light 'for all men'; and so does the Group movement in the technique which it prescribes as the method of securing guidance on all details of conduct. That in difficulty and perplexity guidance may be sought and will be found is confirmed by Christian experience, but the process of divine disclosure or human discovery is not quite so easy and so simple, as seems to be assumed, and the danger of error is often nearest when there is most assurance of ability to gain the truth. I felt it once to be my painful duty to tell a self-confident young minister that he claimed the guidance of the Holy Spirit for conduct in which no decent and sensible man would indulge. Taking a wider survey over the history of human morals, we are bewildered by the confusing and conflicting deliverances of conscience. What at one time was not only tolerated but approved as right, at another is condemned as wrong; what in one country is virtue is in another vice. The Old Testament represents actions which the Christian conscience condemns as not only morally right, but as commanded by God. The belief in the verbal inspiration of the whole of the Old Testament caused distressing confusion in many Christian moral standards. A creed in its conservatism may preserve conceptions of God which conscience in its progress regards as intolerable. We cannot claim that every deliverance of conscience is the authentic voice of God, and that each individual conscience is His infallible oracle. We have to recognize two facts about the contents of conscience as beyond doubt or denial. (1) Although, as has already been indicated, moral progress has depended even in the early stages of social evolution, on moral pioneers, men of keener and greater discernment than their fellows, yet in the less developed tribes or nations morality appears as custom—not as conscience. 'It is not done,' or 'everybody is doing it' affords the individual his moral ready-reckoner, as to what he may not do or must do; and the customs carry with them sanctions of praise or blame, reward or punishment, that provide the motives of conduct. The cohesion necessary for the preservation of any society imposes a restraint and constraint that leaves no room for individual freedom of judgment, sentiment, or action. (2) A close examination of customs, immoral as many of them may appear from the standpoint of a more developed conscience, shows that they had their relative justification as the then only discoverable, or at least discovered means of social preservation. The total conditions of the life of a society, its entire environment, affect the formation, continuance, or abandonment of the customs which constitute its morality. It is not man's sin that is the sole factor in the development of his morals which is responsible for the many defects of his moral standards: his imperfection, apart from his transgression, the gradualness which is imposed on human development, individual or corporate, must be taken into account. Brunner in his book, *The Divine Imperative*, is constantly condemning as sin what should be recognized as imperfection. How much nearer the truth is the generosity of the judgment of Jesus: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Lk 23^{34}), or even the concession of Paul that 'sin is not imputed when there is no law' (Ro 5). Not only is pain and sin a problem for theistic faith, great, if not as great, is the problem presented by the evolution of the human race, the slowness of man's advance from the ape to the angel, from the kinsman of the beast to the brother of Jesus the Christ the Lord. In view of all the facts, we must recognize that for

each man conscience has authority: yet it is quite an unwarranted claim that each individual conscience is sufficient and infallible and does not need education and development.

4. It is not a contradiction of what has been said about the value of the individual conscience as a factor in moral progress to insist that there may be an assertion of *the individual conscience* which is a challenge of the *social obligation*. As a member of society, a man should recognize that the greater part of the content of his conscience, the guiding principles which he holds, he has not discovered for himself, but received as an inheritance; that in the development of his conscience he is being influenced by the advances being secured in the social standards around him; and that even when he believes that his conscience is advancing beyond these standards, it is his duty to exercise a severe self-scrutiny, lest he be deceiving himself as to his superior insight and be a rebel and not a pioneer, deserving blame and not praise. Before any man comes to a moral decision, in which he not only opposes himself to current standards of morality, but repudiates in so doing social obligations generally recognized, he must as far as possible take into account all the consequences of his action, not only for himself, but for others; and he must even face the question as to the consequences of his action, if by his example he encouraged others to take a course of action, which, if it became general, would endanger the preservation of the Society, the protection to person and property which it is the duty of the Government of any society to afford. There are assertions of individual conscience which involve repudiation of social obligation.

5. These two steps in my argument—the communal relation of individual and society, and the demand on the individual conscience to respect and take into account the social obligation have brought me to the conclusion I wish to advance regarding what may be considered as a crucial instance, in which individualism appears to assert itself against communalism, and individual conscience to repudiate social obligation, namely, the conscientious objector to military service, or the *pacifist*. However mistaken and even in some instances perverse his moral judgment may appear to the community generally, contrary to its accepted standards of social obligation, the value of the individual conscience as a factor in moral progress is so great as to demand respect and toleration for him. It is a distinct evidence of the improvement in morals, that the treatment is being accorded to the pacifist to-day, which was often withheld during the last great war. Even in dubious cases, where the refusal to serve is based on objections to the economic system or the political order, which can scarcely be dignified as conscientious, the applicant should get the benefit of the doubt, not that he deserves it, but that the principle of toleration should be preserved. One gets the impression that in a very large number of cases, there has been no independent exercise of conscience, but submission to the pressure of a zealous and skilful propaganda, as by such organizations as the Peace Pledge Union. Many of the younger members have not reached such moral maturity as would make them capable of such independent judgment. If it were true, but I hesitate to believe it, that applicants have been coached what to say in defence of their position, I should not hesitate to condemn such a practice as going beyond the limits of legitimate propaganda. If a man has reached a moral conviction, which carries with it the obligation to share it with others, one cannot blame him, nor in most cases should one forbid his doing his best to persuade others. If, however, such a propaganda endangered the security and the vital interests of the community, a suicidal toleration could not be expected. Pacifism, zealous and skilful as has been its propaganda, has not been and is not likely to become a danger; and the principle of toleration can be generously applied, and any private persecution, as by employers or fellow-workers, which seek to negate the public toleration is to be condemned. The pacifist may, however, be asked to consider whether he is justified in continuing to enjoy the emoluments and amenities of his privileged position, when the majority of men of his age are called on to make so great sacrifices, affecting their families as well as themselves. I cannot respect the man whose conscience serves his self-interests: I can respect the man who is ready for any service, disagreeable or dangerous, in which he can show his disinterested devotion to the community. If he can best serve where and as he now is, let him show his sincerity by some equivalent surrender of his own advantage.

6. While pacifism is happily not a danger at present, it might, if more generally accepted and asserted, prove to be so. It does involve in my judgment a repudiation of social obligation. The community has a claim on every citizen for such service as he can render, and such sacrifice as he may endure as is necessary for its protection and preservation in need and danger. The pacifist who refuses combatant service can legitimately

plead that his individual conscience demands such partial repudiation of his social obligation; the absolute pacifist, who refuses every form of alternative service of the nation, because he disapproves of the policy of the nation in going to war, is stretching the claims of his conscience to breaking-point; just as justifiably might Liberals refuse to pay their income-tax because they disapproved of Protection as the policy of the Conservative government; this is for me no fanciful illustration, as it is for me not a matter of political expediency, but of moral principle, that the earthly goods which the Heavenly Father in His bounty has provided for His children shall be freely shared with no selfish hindrances, individual or corporate. In asserting his objection to combatant service, still more to non-combatant service, the pacifist seems to me to be claiming the benefits and disowning the duties of citizenship in so far as the preservation and protection of life is concerned. Too conscientious to take the life of an 'enemy' he is not conscientious enough to do what he can to save the lives of his fellow-citizens, so far as by his resistance to aggression he could and should. A man may be justified in sacrificing his own life in non-resistance: even in this case a doubt may arise, if in so doing he sacrifices the interests of dependents. But, even if he is fully justified, has he a moral right to allow the sacrifice of other lives if he might by any chance save them? His conscience seems to be more sensitive as regards enemies than dependents or friends or fellow-countrymen who in my judgment have a higher claim, since these are more intimate relations of family, friendship and citizenship within the general relation to all mankind, which impose more immediate obligations.

7. The moralist dealing with abstractions may agree that the moral value of an action lies in its motive; but in concrete instances we must take into account consequences. The action that has bad consequences which were foreseen, or with more care in considering the situation could have been foreseen, cannot be pronounced as good, no matter how excellent the motive. 'More harm is wrought by want of thought than even want of heart,' is an excuse and not a justification of actions the consequences of which are bad. It is a defective heart that neglects the effective use of thought to ensure that harm will not be wrought. A consistent pacifist must desire that all men should be as he is, pacifists also; he cannot desire to belong to an exclusive moral aristocracy, content to acquiesce in, and get advantage from the general democracy that treads the common path of accepting all the obligations which citizenship is generally understood to impose. What would the consequences of general pacifism be? The tragic situation of repression, privation, and humiliation, suffering, sorrow, shame in Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, Greece, and even Germany itself is the answer. Force, falsehood, fraud as the means of indescribably inhuman ends dominate a large part of Europe. Are pacifists willing that these conditions should continue, and that our island, the last stronghold and bulwark of freedom, should be subjected to them? If so, I do not envy them their defective moral vision, in not recognizing that there are worse things for sane moral judgment than war, and better things than peace, if war means liberation from such degradation of humanity and peace can be secured only by the dishonour of submission. Their obsession by the evils of war, great and many as they are, must have made them morally obtuse in an incredible degree. If they do not will those consequences, but desire liberation and not suppression, then they are shirking a duty and wish others to do and to endure a terrible and yet glorious task, to make a heroic sacrifice from which their individual conscience offers them a way of escape.

8. From this dilemma some pacifists find an exit in what seems to me an unwarranted demand on God. God, they console themselves, would somehow intervene, and prevent the consequences of their conduct, if it became general. Human history, interpreted as divine providence, offers no justification for such an assumption; nor do the Holy Scriptures interpreted by devout but not superstitious theology. God has given man freedom and lets him reap as he sows. Are we warranted in expecting that God will somehow make Nazi Germany impotent to do further evil, or will turn it from its evil ways? We may ask: How? and there is no answer. His omnipotence does not destroy man's freedom, nor His grace compel faith. The Jewish people chose Barabbas, not Jesus. I believe that the teaching of pacifism is itself a false interpretation of the Holy Scriptures and the Christian revelation: but I have not discussed the matter here, because that has been and is being competently done: but what is not so common, and is in this article attempted is to set this particular moral instance in the wider setting of the relation of the individual to society and more particularly of the individual conscience to social obligation, a subject on which false assumptions prevail and true considerations are ignored and neglected.

Nazarene and Nazareth.

By the Reverend W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

The designation *Nazarene*, when coupled with the name of Jesus, occurs eighteen times in the New Testament, and always with the definite article. An exception occurs in Mk 1^{24}: 'What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus, a Nazarene?' In Mt 2^{23}, in reference to Him, but not coupled with His name, it is said: 'And (Joseph) came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that he (*i.e.* "the young child") should be called a Nazarene'; see further on this below. In our English Versions the Greek, 'Jesus the Nazarene' is always rendered 'Jesus of Nazareth,' though in three instances the Revised Version follows the Greek (Mt 26^{71}, Mk 14^{67} 16^{6}).

The next thing to be noted is that the Greek has two forms for 'the Nazarene,' namely, *Nazōraios* and *Nazarēnos*; the former twice in Matthew, once in Luke, three times in John, and seven times in Acts; the latter, four times in Mark and twice in Luke. It must be added that in one of its occurrences, in Acts, it is not used with the name of Jesus, for in 24^{5} mention is made of 'the sect of the Nazarenes'; in 28^{22} we read that the chief men of the Jews in Rome, who visit St. Paul in prison, say to him: 'But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, it is known to us that everywhere it is spoken against'; the name of the 'sect' is not mentioned, but doubtless it was the subject of St. Paul's previous talk with his visitors (*v.*[17]).

From what has been said a few questions arise which demand some consideration, though it be but brief. First, however, we may be permitted to offer a few remarks on the section Mt 2^{13-18}; the reason for doing so will become evident as we proceed. The section is a striking illustration of the way in which Old Testament passages are sometimes utilized in order to show how Christian truths were foretold, or at least foreshadowed. The method is Jewish; the purpose, that of commending Christianity to Jews. Thus, in *vv.*[14. 15] the flight into Egypt is followed by the implied departure out of Egypt, and this latter is said to have been undertaken in order that the words of the prophet might be fulfilled; these words are in Hos 11^{1}: 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.' The evangelist treats these words as a prophecy of Jesus being brought out of Egypt by His parents, in spite of the inappropriateness of what follows about Israel sacrificing to the Baals, and burning incense to graven images! Again, in *vv.*[17. 18], the mourning occasioned by the massacre of the male children of Bethlehem is said to be the fulfilment of what purports to be Yahweh's words in Jer 31^{15}; but this is the prophet's poetical picture figuring Rachel, whose tomb was near Ramah (1 S 10^{2}), weeping for 'her children,' the reference being to the Jews who, after the fall of Jerusalem in 586, were led away captive to Babylon (see Jer 40^{1}). Here we have, then, two instances of parallel ideas in the Old and New Testaments, respectively, brought into connexion with one another, however different their genesis: Israel being called out of Egypt, and Jesus being brought out of Egypt; and then, the weeping for 'children' carried away captive, and the weeping for children put to death; in each case the one being, moreover, conceived of as pointing to the other. Such a method of interpretation does not appeal to us; but the oriental caste of mind envisages things differently. Nevertheless, however this may be, we cannot fail to recognize the evangelist's conviction of the truths that the Hebrew nation in all its vicissitudes, and Hebrew religion with its many undeveloped beliefs, constituted, in the divine foreknowledge, a preparation for, and a way-mark to, Christianity. The Gospel under his name witnesses to this again and again.

We come now to deal with one or two questions which arise in connexion with the term *Nazarene*. In Mt 2^{23}, quoted above, it is said that Jesus should be called a Nazarene (Nazōræan), 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets.' When we seek for what was 'spoken by the prophets' about this, we are faced with a difficulty; for no prophet refers to the subject, or applies *Nazarene* (Nazōræan) to the Messiah; and the city of Nazareth is never mentioned in the Old Testament. Insoluble as this difficulty appears at first sight, it can be explained; but here again it must be recognized that Oriental methods are sometimes wanting in exactitude, according to

Western ideas. In Hebrew there are two letters which correspond to our 'z'; the difference in pronunciation is slight, one being a little harder than the other;[1] and Hebrew was originally written without vowels.[2] When, therefore, words occurred in the Hebrew of the Old Testament with the consonants *n, z, r*, there was a natural tendency to regard them as related, and as there is reason to believe that the Hebrew name of Nazareth was *Nazara* (hard *z*), as in Mt 4^{13}, Lk 4^{16} (see below), the Evangelist naturally concluded that the Old Testament words with the letters *n, z, r* had a connexion with Nazara (Nazareth), and therefore with Jesus the Nazōræan (Nazarene).

Now, in Is $11^{1ff.}$ the prophet says: 'And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch (*nezer*) out of his roots shall bear fruit; and the spirit of Yahweh shall rest upon him. . . .' The whole passage (*vv.*$^{1-10}$) is clearly Messianic, describing, as it does, the Messianic Age; a descendant of Jesse, who will be the Messiah, is designated *NZR* (*Nezer*); the Evangelist believed that 'Jesus Christ, the son of David' (1^{1}), was 'the Christ,' the Messiah (1^{17}); he spoke of Him as *NeZaRi*, as he would have pronounced it (Nazōræan, 2^{23}); the similarity of the two words, added to their Messianic identity, readily explains why the evangelist wrote, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets. . . .' Then, what about the 'prophets,' in the plural? In the first place, Messianic passages in other prophetical books, even though without any direct mention of *Nezer*, would quite justifiably be regarded by the evangelist as illustrative of Is 11^{1}, for in prophesying about the Messiah, though without naming him, the prophets in question belonged to the same category as Isaiah; see, *e.g.*, Ezk 34^{20-30}, Mic 5^{2-9}, Zech 9^{9-12}. But there was something else; in Hebrew there is another word for 'branch,' namely *Zemach*; so that if a prophet used this word in reference to the Messiah, it was, in effect, the same thing as though he had used *Nezer*; see, *e.g.*, Jer 23^{5-8} 33^{14-16}. That the evangelist made reference to 'prophets,' in the plural, was, thus, quite a natural procedure; doubtless inexact in detail, but true in the larger issue.

Once more, another question arises: How are we to account for the two Greek forms of 'Nazarene,' mentioned above? Various interesting and ingenious explanations have been suggested; we shall not discuss these here, for serious objections against each of them have been raised. It is just possible that there is quite a simple explanation, namely, that the two Greek forms merely represent two current varieties of pronunciation. In the Syriac Versions this difference of pronunciation is ignored, both the Greek forms appearing as *Nazăraya*.

This brings us to the name of the city of Nazareth, the form of which is uncertain. Some Greek manuscripts have the ending *-rath*, others *-rat*; the Syriac Versions read *Nazarath*. Now, one of the Greek adjectival forms, as we have seen, is *Nazarēnos*, 'Nazarene'; this suggests Nazara as the name of the city, and this is the form of the name in Mt 4^{13}, Lk 4^{16}. The question therefore arises as to whether there ever was a city named Nazareth, and whether its real name may not have been Nazara. As we have just seen, there are grounds for believing that this was so; and there are some form-parallels which support this belief; thus, just as we have Nazara in Mt 4^{13}, Lk 4^{16}, an inhabitant of which is called a Nazarene (Mt 2^{23}), so there is Magdala (Mt 15^{39})[3] and Magdalene (Mt 26^{56}, Lk 8^{2}); Gederah[4] (Jos 15^{36}) and Gadarenes (Mt 5^{1}, Lk 8^{26}), and others.

A word must be added about the *Nazarenes* (Ac 24^{5}), *i.e.* the followers of Jesus the Nazarene. Their name shows that they were all Jews at this time, which is also implied by their being called a 'sect'; they still belonged, therefore, to the Jewish community, though 'spoken against.' This may be illustrated by what is said in Ac 2^{42}. After St. Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost to the 'men of Judæa, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem,' we read that 'they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers'; that by 'the prayers' here are meant the prayers of the Jewish Liturgy is shown by what is said in *v.*^{46}: 'And day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home. . . .' The first Christians, therefore, continued to belong to the Jewish community; and this applies to the Nazarenes. But the total rift between Jews and Christians was soon to come. St. Paul's imprisonment in Rome may be dated about A.D. 60. During the years which followed, the relations between the

[1] Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (Eng. ed. by Cowley, 1910), 33.

[2] 'As the Hebrew writing on the monuments and coins consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old Testament books used merely the consonant-signs' (*Ib.*, 12).

[3] The reading Magadan is a variant of Magdala, which occurs in several important manuscripts; cf. Jos 15^{37} 19^{38}.

[4] Or Gadara, see G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (1910), 459 ff.

Nazarenes and the Jewish authorities in Palestine must have become more and more strained. Of details we have no knowledge, but evidence of this, though indirect, is forthcoming. A notable element in the Jewish Liturgy, dating mainly from pre-Christian times, is known as the *Tephillah*, 'Prayer,' because it is the prayer *par excellence* of the Synagogue; it is also called the *Shemône 'Esreh*, 'eighteen,' because it consists of this number of benedictions, 'Blessed art thou'; but petitions are also embodied. Originally the number was smaller, but additions were made from time to time. Now, at about the end of the first century of our era a petition was added which signalized a definite break between the Nazarenes and the Jewish Church; this addition was due to Gamaliel, the second of the name, who is mentioned in Ac 5^{34}; he was the recognized head of the Palestinian Jews from about A.D. 80. The petition he added has undergone changes through the ages, but there is patristic evidence[1] to show that the following quotation from the most recently discovered manuscript of the *Tephillah*[2] represents, at any rate in substance, what Gamaliel caused to be added: 'Let there be no hope for the apostates; and arrogant rulership (presumably in reference to Roman overlordship) eradicate speedily in our days; and may the *Nozerim* (Nazarenes) and the *Minim* (heretics) quickly perish; let them be blotted out of the book of life, and not be reckoned among the righteous. Praise be to thee, O Lord, who humblest the presumptuous.'[3]

We have, thus, painfully clear evidence of the bitter feelings entertained by the Jewish authorities towards the Jewish-Christian Nazarenes. It can hardly be doubted that Gamaliel's action must be interpreted as pointing to their expulsion from the Jewish community.

With the subsequent history of the Nazarenes we cannot deal here.

[1] Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, and Jerome; quotations are given by Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 544.

[2] In the *Genizah* ('lumber-room') of the Cairo synagogue; see Schechter in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, x. (1898), 656 f.

[3] It must be emphasized that the present form of this 'Benediction' in the Jewish Prayer Book has no mention of the *Nozerim* or of the *Minim*.

Literature.

The Rev. J. McPherson, D.D., who is an acknowledged authority on the religious customs and antiquities of the north-east of Scotland, has published a new volume, *The Kirk's Care of the Poor* (Avery & Co., Aberdeen; 5s. net). It is a veritable mine of information, drawn from Kirk Session records, dealing with a subject which was a main interest of Church life in the past. Following a survey of the 'Social Background' which reveals an appalling state of poverty, the book is divided into two parts which tell of how funds were raised and how they were disbursed. The raising of poor funds was no easy matter in days when the thrifty worshipper would put a halfpenny in the plate and take out a farthing change, sometimes exchanging a base coin for a good one. The variety of foreign and spurious coins is astonishing. We hear of hardheids, doits, flower-de-luces, boddles, turners, Hibernians, harps, and Maggie Robs. The variety of uses to which the money raised was put was equally great—meal to the poor, assistance to travellers, wooden legs to the lame, funeral expenses, including allowances for whisky, beer, pipes, and tobacco, upbringing of orphans, etc. A touch of pathos is given in the provision of a house in Elgin 'to the use of the puir litle ains quhilt gretis throch the toun under the silens of nycht.' A stately testimonial is given to a young widow who 'came into this parish two years ago, the beautiful and affectionate wife of a young soldier, then obviously approximating his disembodied state in a consumptive disease.' The whole book is a product of immense research and is a delight to read.

This is the Day, by Miss Phyllis L. Garlick (C.M.S.; 6d.), is the Church Missionary Society's review of the year 1940–41. It is admirably written and is far removed from the proverbial dryness of a mere report. The magnitude of the Society's work may be gauged by the fact that '7000 parishes, about half the total in England, give £1000 a day which helps to maintain 1000 missionaries and their work.' Its vitality is indicated by the encouraging circumstance that even under war conditions its income shows only a reduction of about two per

cent. The news from the various fields in Africa and the East is wonderfully hopeful and stimulating.

Dr. Murdo Mackenzie, the well-known Harley Street nerve specialist, has written an interesting and instructive book on *The Human Mind* (Churchill; 7s. 6d. net). His general thesis is that the mind is 'a vital and discrete thinking organ. . . . Like every functioning organ it works in terms of time, space, and rhythm. When it is working in regular rhythm, thinking is confident; when in irregular rhythm, thinking is in terms of Anxiety punctuated by Apathy.' Avoiding the usual technique of psycho-analysis and psychotherapy, and using a terminology of his own, he shows how the mental forces may be disorganized and overwhelmed by depression, anxiety, or apathy. He gives ample illustrations from his own clinical experience, and his methods of treatment are characterized by what appeals to the lay mind as sound common sense. His style of writing is at times delightfully breezy, as the following may indicate. 'The therapeutic aim should be to take the sting out of Anxiety Thinking rather than to drive it away, and to inspire a sense of contempt for it rather than a dread; thus making it easy to say, "Let the beastly thing tick over if it must; it is only an organ, when all is said and done, and when left to itself it will come to. Why should I do and think silly things at its command?" In this way, and in this way only, mental relaxation becomes a real possibility.' In a final chapter dealing with mental reactions to the War he treats of the methods and effect of enemy propaganda and gives the comforting assurance that 'Hitler, genius or no, mad or sane, is a common-sense brute, and, technically, a psychological ignoramus.'

The Oriental Society of the University of Glasgow has published its *Transactions* at fairly regular intervals during the last forty years. In all nine volumes have appeared, of which the most recent covers the years 1938 and 1939. The editor is Professor C. J. Mullo Weir, B.D., D.Phil. (Civic Press, Glasgow; 6s. net). It shows that interest in the Nearer East is still well maintained in Glasgow, and that it covers a very wide range. There are two philological studies by Professor Stevenson, of which the second is an instructive study of the mnemonic use of numbers in the Wisdom literature, supplemented by notes on such phrases as 'two or three.' Old Testament studies are also represented by a discussion of the terms Saddik and Rasha, by Dr. John Kennedy; a study of the meaning of the veil that was on the face of Moses, by the Rev. James Wilson; and an outline of some of the permanent values in the Old Testament by Dr. T. C. Gordon. Other papers deal with Non-resistance in Islam (Rev. James Robson), The Place of the Hurrites in Early Near-Eastern History (Professor C. J. Mullo Weir), and Mithraism as a Rival to Christianity (Rev. G. Carstairs). Most of the papers appear to be presented only as summaries, but, even so, it is clear that they represent a genuine vitality in the Society which heard them, and some of them probably provoked keen discussion. We may hope that the present war, like the last, will not prevent the Society from resuming its activities and rendering yet further service to the cause of Oriental studies.

Christian Belief and Practice, by the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt. (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net), is described as 'a text-book for the teaching of *Christianity To-day*.' It is intended for the guidance of clergy and teachers who are called upon to give instruction to Confirmation candidates. For this purpose it appears to be adequate and highly suitable. After certain preparatory sections the book is divided into two main parts, namely, Nine Lessons on the Christian Faith, and Thirteen Lessons on the Christian Church and the Christian Life. Dealing with such a variety of topics the writer could not hope to command the assent of all his readers. There is a general inclination towards the modernist type of thought. Evolution is taught all too confidently as if it were a single, consistent and fully established theory; no distinction seems to be made between the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection and the Greek theory of immortality, and in dealing with the Bible little stress is laid on it as the vehicle of a special Word of God to man. But the book is full of good things and though the predominance given to Church of England practice makes it most suitable for teachers of that communion it cannot fail to be most helpful in wider circles.

Facing Life with Confidence (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Leslie J. Tizard, B.A., B.D., B.Litt., is a series of religious essays that might well be regarded as an exposition of the Pauline phrase, 'more than conquerors.' The book is written in the belief that the religion of Jesus can help us to abandon 'the pitiful and always unsuccessful attempt' to escape from life, that it can help us to face life with courage and confidence. The style is simple and clear. There are many

'illustrations,' both old and new. Trouble, temptation, sin, doubt, old age, death and bereavement, such are the experiences of life that are passed under review. Dr. A. Maude Royden supplies a commendatory foreword.

The annual report of the National Bible Society of Scotland, published under the title of *Great Boldness, Great Power, Great Grace*, is a mine of information about work in many mission fields. It makes heartsome reading, especially in view of the difficulties created by the War. Specially notable is the fact that the sale of Bibles and Scripture portions in war-torn China shows an increase of almost a hundred and sixty-six thousand, and amounts to nearly a million and a quarter. The late Rev. Malcolm Moffat, we note, is referred to as the grand-nephew of David Livingstone. He was in fact the nephew of Mrs. Livingstone. The Bible Society has great reason to thank God and take courage.

Karl Marx and Communism (S.P.C.K.; 4d.) is No. 172 of the publishers' series of 'Little Books on Religion.' The writer is the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A., who is well known as an able and popular Christian apologist; and this contribution from his pen shows that he has not lost his ability to grasp the essentials of his theme and review them in the light of Christian principles.

Secular Despair and Christian Faith (S.C.M.; 2s. net), by the Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., consists of a series of addresses delivered during a mission to Liverpool University in February, 1941. There is no hope for man, it is urged, unless he despairs of his own capacity to achieve the best that he knows. Jesus Christ, in whom a new humanity has been brought into being, is God's answer to man's despair. It is by a response of the whole person to the Person of Jesus Christ that man is justified in God's sight. This is 'justification by faith,' and it is the author's contention that this fundamental postulate of the Christian religion puts the activities represented by marriage and the family, the university, and politics, in quite a new light. He has much that is cogent as well as topical to say on those subjects, but somehow we do not find in the exposition any definite reference to the thought, or at any rate the thought-form, of justification by faith.

In *The Truth about Spiritualism* (S C.M.; 2s. net) the Reverend Canon Harold Anson, Master of the Temple, has written a popular account of Spiritualism from the Christian point of view. He writes with great understanding and sympathy while he makes plain the dangers and limitations of the cult. Few Christians perhaps will agree with his judgment that 'if we reject this evidence (of communication with the dead) we ought also logically to reject the evidence upon which the great facts of our Christian faith are founded.' But this little book gives on the whole a wise and well-balanced pronouncement on the subject.

After some years of concentration on other branches of theology, the Rev. L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D., has come back to the Old Testament, the sphere in which his name first became known to Biblical students. Not only so, but in his recent lectures on Jeremiah—*Jeremiah: A Prophet for a Time of War* (S.C.M.; 5s. net)—he is handling a theme on which he was a recognized authority. Even if some readers may feel that Dr. Binns has not taken sufficient account of the advance in the criticism of the prophets which has been made since the publication of his commentary on Jeremiah, they will welcome the new book for its intrinsic value. Sound exegesis of the Hebrew prophets involves a double process, first the isolation of eternal principles from the temporal, local, and personal conditions in which they are enshrined, and then their re-interpretation in terms of modern life. We could hardly have had a better illustration of the method than that which Dr. Binns has given us. His long study of the Book of Jeremiah and his close familiarity with it have given him exceptional insight into the character and teaching of the prophet, while his instincts as a historian have enabled him to lay stress on those features in the social, political, and religious life of Jeremiah's day which have the clearest and most pertinent message for our own times. Like ourselves, Jeremiah lived in one of those critical periods of history when the whole face of the world changes in a single generation; like us, too, he had to face doubt and pain. Dr. Binns is careful to indicate the differences as well as the resemblances between our situation and that of the world at the end of the seventh century B.C. (*e.g.*, the Assyrians offer a close, but not exact, parallel to Nazi Germany), and from the resemblances he is able to draw the lessons that we need. Once again, it is difficult to imagine a better handling of the subject, whether we regard it as an exposition of the prophet's meaning or as a message for our own hearts.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

IX. Prayer.

By the Right Reverend J. W. Hunkin, D.D., Bishop of Truro.

Prayer is the most universal of specifically religious activities. Its origins may be traced beyond the dawn of history. In practically all nations there are men of prayer, and most human beings sometimes pray.

It is indeed an exercise *prima facie* suggested by the whole order of things. No one thinking of the Spring unfolding itself in all its miraculous freshness, can be unconscious of the fact that beauty is constantly being created. No one is not at some time or other made aware of some flash of real goodness in the creatures and in man. Beauty and goodness are continually being brought into existence. It is natural to infer that a great source of beauty and goodness exists. And if so, it is plainly man's highest happiness to ally himself with that source of beauty and goodness for all he is worth.

How is man to picture that great originating power? If the representation is to be a vivid one it must be made in terms sufficiently understood and familiar. Man himself is by far the highest product of Creation with which he is familiar. The Creator cannot have less powers and potencies than those of human nature: more undoubtedly, indefinably more.

The figure of a Heavenly Father, greater in goodness and beauty and power than human imagination can reach, is the nearest we can get. That is evidently what Christ Himself felt. This conception of God was not new in His day, but He put new life into it, and taught His followers to base their whole thought and practice upon it.

Now, if this be the best working idea we are capable of forming of Supreme Being, our own proper attitude must be, in the best sense of the word, *the child-like attitude*: simple, unaffected, direct, expectant, trustful. Prayer is the lifting up of the whole self of the child to the all-loving, the all-wise, and the Most High, Father: the lifting up of thought and feeling and will.

The practice of prayer must be governed throughout by this fundamental conception. If this conception be true, the question is, what is *fitting* in the light of it? It is plainly *fitting* that mind and heart should be lifted up in some expression of love and thankfulness, of aspiration and desire. If He is our Divine Father and we are His little children we want consciously to be in His presence, to hold His hand, and to have His smile upon us. Which, translated into the usual language of prayer, means to have communion of spirit with Him. This is possible because we are His offspring and fundamentally of a nature kindred to Himself. 'Of him we are also kindred' as the poet Aratus sang in the third century B.C.—the phrase, of course, is quoted in St Paul's speech at Athens as reported by St. Luke (Ac 17^{28}). No one has expressed the truth in modern times better than Tennyson:

> Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
> Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

The psychologist may not be able to distinguish communion with one's 'higher self' from communion with God; but, in point of fact, aspiration—the ardent desire to rise, to become and be and do the best of which we are capable, the reaching forward and up to that, the dedication of one's self to the Highest, the appeal to the Highest for help—*is* a form of communion with God. Such communion does actually draw us up and on, towards the development of a whole personality, towards the ideal, towards holiness.

In considering the various methods of prayer we must bring every suggestion back to the touchstone of the one fundamental conception, namely, the conception of our filial relation with *the Author and Giver of all good*. For instance, it will at once be clear that, if we are *individually* children of our Father in Heaven we are *together* members of His family, and therefore it will not be fitting to neglect either private or public prayer. Human experience offers abundant testimony to the value of both. Occasions will stand out in the memory of every reader of these words, when prayer in a moment of crisis or danger has brought strength and steadiness to the soul. My own mind always goes back to an experience of unbelievable peace in the midst of

very heavy shelling in the late war. As for corporate prayer, let George Herbert speak :

> Tho' private prayer be a brave design,
> Yet public hath more promises, more love ;
> And love's a weight to hearts, to eyes a sign.
> We all are but cold suitors ; let us move
> Where it is warmest. Leave thy six and seven,
> Pray with the most ; for where most pray is heaven.

Again, when we raise the question of specific requests, the same fundamental conception of the Father-child relationship must decide. Little children do not repress their desires : they make them known in simplicity and trustfulness. And so may we in prayer. At the same time, children, if they really trust their Father, will readily learn not to pester Him by attempting insistence. Neither must we. Indeed, when we are at our best, we want only to pray prayers of which He will approve. 'Not our will, but Thine be done'—because Thine is, certainly and without a doubt, best.

Thus in war-time, with this over-ruling proviso, we may, and should, pray freely for what we sincerely feel would be best. Some of the prayers already published are admirable, and give clear and beautiful expression to desires we all share, and feel justified in sharing. Freshness of wording is desirable from time to time, and on that ground the following brief prayer is suggested as a prayer for our leaders at the present moment :

> O Lord God Almighty, may thy Holy Spirit inspire and guide the minds of all those who have the responsibility of leadership, that they may see clearly and act decisively ; so that the days of our tribulation may be shortened and we may give thanks to Thee for our final deliverance, through Jesus Christ Our Lord.

The question how specific requests become effective is part of the larger question, how does God act on the world at all? It is certain that He does not act in any arbitrary or spasmodic manner. He operates in an orderly way, but not in a dully mechanical way. Natural Science finds movement *per saltum* at various points in the order of Nature. Every now and then a lovely new flower appears as a 'sport.' Discoveries are constantly being made as to the variety of God's methods in the whole scheme of the Universe. If the scheme includes this Father-child relationship between the Creator-Spirit and the creature man, then scope must have been provided for man's activities : and in some respects there plainly is. No entirely satisfactory explanation has yet been given of what we feel as *human freedom* ; but though it has not been *explained*, it cannot be *explained away*. Prayer is one of the *natural*—one might almost say *instinctive*—activities of man ; and we shall not be rash if we assume that room has been left in the construction of the world for its effective operation. We believe that the Divine Spirit is mightily at work and the sphere or region or order in which the Spirit moves is the sphere or region or order in which we may look for the operation of prayer. Until recently no one knew that it was possible to send out and receive the electric waves which are the transmitting force behind the wireless broadcasts. Even now not every one believes in telepathy, and only a few have had any very noteworthy first-hand telepathic experience. But there *may* be, indeed there evidently *must* be, a nexus of reality through which spiritual impulses are effectively transmitted. And it is in this region that prayer '*works*.'

One final word : it is not necessary to believe that God is Almighty, in the sense that He can do anything whatever, in order to pray with faith and confidence. The present war, in itself, is sufficient to prove that God is not Almighty in that sense. It is orthodox to say that for His wisest purposes (including, for example, the creation of creative human personalities) He has limited Himself. At all events there certainly *is* limitation. But even so—

> His love is as great as His Power
> And neither knows measure nor end.

The seriousness of any situation does not alter these fundamental principles of Prayer, but only puts them to the test. The present situation is terribly serious. Never have we been called upon to withstand such a terrific onslaught of sinister and relentless brutality. Never have we been so oppressed by the sense of menacing evil. Our hearts cry, and cry continually, and cannot but cry, 'Deliver us. . . . Lead us not into trial (*peirasmos*), but rescue us from evil—ourselves, all whom we love, . . . the captive and suffering peoples . . . the blinded fevered German folk as well.'

A situation of terror is anticipated in the New Testament itself : 'fearful sights . . . distress of nations with perplexity . . . men's hearts failing them for fear' (Lk 21). 'Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold' (Mt 24). 'Except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved : but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days' (Mk 8, Mt 24).

And still the word to us is : 'men ought always to pray, and not to faint' (Lk 18). 'He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved' (Mk 13, Mt 10, 20 ; cf. Lk 21).

Present-day Preaching and the Life to Come.

By the Reverend Professor N. V. Hope, B.D., New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Jersey, U.S.A.

Dr. George Jackson, the well-known Methodist preacher and writer, in one of his fortnightly articles in the *Manchester Guardian* recently, discussed the question of 'Preaching in War-time.' In the course of his article Dr. Jackson said this: 'Above all, this is the time for the Church to declare with conviction its ancient faith concerning the life of the world to come. If we really do believe what our Scriptures affirm, that Christ has brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel—now is the time to make it known.' And he went on to tell Canon J. O. Hannay's story of the young officer going into battle during the World War of 1914–18, who said to his chaplain: 'Padre, I wish you would tell me what you think about it. Is there really anything afterwards? Do we go on living in any sort of way, or—do we just go out? You mustn't think I'm an atheist, or a sceptic, or anything like that; I'm not. I used to go to church pretty regularly. I never doubted about any of the things I was taught. I just took them as they came. I supposed they were all right. Anyhow, I didn't bother. *But now I want to know.*' Now, said Dr. Jackson, it is to such men as this, who want to know for a surety about the life to come, that the Christian pulpit must minister to-day.

Among serious Christians there will be little doubt as to the wisdom and timeliness of Dr. Jackson's counsel in this matter. Though the immortal hope, the gospel of eternal life, is an integral part of the Christian message as set down in the New Testament, it has tended to be soft-pedalled of recent years in Christian pulpits. One reason for this under-emphasis on the life to come has probably been the fact that in society at large there has been what Sir George Adam Smith called an 'ebb from the shores of another life.' Men and women, absorbed in the manifold secular activities opened up by modern science, have tended to adopt H. D. Thoreau's dictum, 'One world at a time.' And Christian preachers have imbibed, perhaps unconsciously, something of the this-worldly atmosphere and attitude thus generated in society. But another, and perhaps even more powerful, reason for this paucity of reference to the Christian assurance of immortality of recent years is this, that in that department of Christian theology which deals with the life to come—eschatology as it is technically termed—traditional teaching has not been such as could be preached with conviction on the part of ministers, or accepted with satisfaction by intelligent worshippers of the present day. To take an obvious example, there was a time—for instance, in New England in the middle of the eighteenth century—when such a sermon as that by Jonathan Edwards on 'Sinners in the hands of an angry God,' in which the preacher metaphorically suspended his hearers over the bottomless pit, could send terrified listeners hurrying to make their peace with God at once. But it is hardly deniable that such preaching to-day would have little or no power to convince sinners of 'sin, righteousness, and judgment to come': it might, indeed, alienate them irrecoverably.

In order, therefore, to carry out Dr. Jackson's admirable counsel at all adequately and fruitfully, Christian preachers should and even must have an eschatology which shall both be faithful to the central Christian verities, and at the same time be preachable to men and women of this day and generation. This article seeks to suggest, in however brief outline, an approach to such a doctrine of 'the last things' for the Christian pulpit and pew of to-day.

To begin with, at this time, when Europe rocks and sways in the convulsions of another great war, it must be stated quite categorically that there is no justification whatever in the Christian gospel for the belief that because a man dies for his country in battle, even if he is unrepentant, he will go straight to heaven. Such a view was sometimes preached from Christian pulpits during the World War of 1914–18. But, though all right-thinking men and women must always honour the gallant heroes who are laying down their lives, not merely for King and country, but also for basic Christian values such as freedom, truth, and justice, there is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that such bravery and self-sacrifice alone will constitute a passport to eternal blessedness. This doctrine, that an enemy bullet shoots a man automatically to heaven, is really Mohammedan, and not Christian at all. According to Christianity, there is none other name given under heaven, whereby we must be saved, than the name of Jesus Christ: He alone is

the Saviour of men. Only through repentance and faith in Him can sinners be redeemed.

Of course, it should be added at once that there is no limit to God's mercy, and that His boundless grace may grip and arrest a man even on the battlefield. There is abundant evidence from the last war, of 1914–18, that many, who had never given Jesus Christ a serious thought during their years at home, were moved to saving faith and repentance in the trenches—sometimes, indeed, on the very brink of death. The eleventh-hour conversion of the penitent thief on the Cross should serve as a standing warning to Christians against attempting to set any limit to God's mercy in Jesus Christ. And the lines,

> Between the saddle and the ground
> I mercy sought, and mercy found,

may very well be found true in the lives of many who are engaged in battle to-day, in which death is a stark and ever-present reality.

While this is so, it cannot be assumed that everyone on the battlefield to-day will necessarily come to God through Jesus Christ in this life. It may be supposed that some, at least, in the armed forces will die in their sins—as, of course, many do and have done in civil life. What is to happen to those who die unrepentant? With regard to such as have had every opportunity and incentive, who have seen Jesus Christ as He really is, but who yet have refused to come to Him, it is difficult to say. But some at least have never been faced squarely with the challenge of Jesus Christ: they were too young to have thought seriously about Him and His claims, or they never saw Him presented in a worthy way in the lives of those who professed His name. In this respect they stand in much the same position as heathen who have never heard of Him at all. It is obvious that Divine justice, and even more Divine love, demand that all who have never had any real opportunity to know Jesus Christ as the Lord of all good life in this world should be given a fair chance in the world to come to see and know Him in all His grace and truth. This suggests that there may be an 'intermediate state' beyond the grave, in which an opportunity to accept Jesus Christ will be given to all who have not had such a chance in this life here. This does not mean any return to the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, whose money-changing abuses lit the fires of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. But it does suggest that traditional Protestantism, however worthy its motives and intentions, has gone too far in asserting that eternal destiny is settled once and for all, for every one, at the moment of physical death. For the idea of an 'intermediate state,' as described above, there is some evidence. The Bible in at least one passage seems to suggest it (1 P 3^{19}). The Apostles' Creed, in stating that Jesus 'descended into Hades,' appears to assume it. And above all, the central and fundamental Christian doctrine of the love of God would seem to demand it.

An alternative solution of this difficulty which has sometimes been advocated is this, that those who have never known Jesus Christ in this life will be judged by God at death, according as they have or have not lived up to the light—dim and imperfect though it may have been—which they have had during their earthly lives. But such a proposal, though it mitigates the gravity of the problem, does not really solve it satisfactorily. For the question must still remain: Why should God give to some of His earthly children the light of the knowledge of His love in Jesus, while denying that light to others? Is it not of the very heart and essence of the Christian revelation of God that He is a Father who has no chosen favourites in His human family? Any discrimination, such as would be involved in revealing Jesus Christ to some men and groups on earth while withholding Him from others, is quite incompatible with the character of God, as He is known to Christian faith in Jesus Christ.

But is it not possible that, even after receiving every chance to accept Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, a soul may refuse His proffered grace? The Bible makes it clear, and all human experience goes to confirm the fact, that such an outcome is perfectly possible. There are souls who, having had every opportunity to come to Jesus Christ and accept Him as Saviour and Lord, have yet refused Him. What will be the ultimate fate of such obdurate impenitents? On this question three theories have been advanced in the course of Christian speculation. The first is that of Eternal Punishment, *i.e.* the view that those who deliberately reject Jesus Christ shall be punished for ever and ever. As to the exact nature of this punishment, different ideas have been expressed: while some have thought that it would consist in crude physical tortures, 'licking flames and sizzling flesh,' others have supposed it to consist rather in the mental agony of remorse and regret for lost opportunity of pardon, and in alienation from God's presence to all eternity. The second theory is that of Conditional Immortality, the essence of which is that those who finally reject Jesus Christ will simply die, and cease to be. And the third is that of Universal Restoration, which means, as its name implies, that all souls—after a long and painful

disciplinary experience it may be—will finally surrender to Jesus, and be received into God's eternal kingdom. Each one of these views can claim a certain measure of textual support in Holy Scripture. For example, passages such as Mt 25^{46} and Mk 9^{48} seem to support the first theory, Mt 7^{13} the second, and 1 Co 15^{22} the third. Again, each of these theories has been sponsored by one or more distinguished Christian scholars and preachers. For instance, Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages and Professor S. D. F. Salmond in modern times have believed in Eternal Punishment; the Reverend Edward White of London and Dr. Robert W. Dale of Birmingham have expounded the theory of Conditional Immortality; Universal Restoration has been espoused by such outstanding theologians of bygone days as Origen and Schleiermacher as well as by modern scholars like Professor John Baillie and modern preachers like the Reverend Leslie D. Weatherhead. But it must be added that against each and every one of these theories grave objections can be urged. Perhaps the wisest Christian attitude to take towards this peculiarly difficult question is what the late Professor H. R. Mackintosh once described as 'the nearly complete agnosticism with respect to the lot of the impenitent which . . . is ordained for faith' (*Immortality and the Future*, 205). That the Judge of all the earth will most certainly do right, is something of which Christian faith is confident; but much more than this it is difficult to affirm with any assurance.

What of those who *do* accept Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord? What kind of life to come is in store for them? Sometimes enthusiastic Christians have spoken and written as if they knew all that could be known about that heaven to which faith looks forward; they have constructed celestial geographies and have even drawn up classified directories of heaven's inhabitants. But quite obviously, in the very nature of the case, there is bound to be much about the life to come which even the most mature and consecrated Christian can never know on this side of the grave. At the same time, however, certain things are clear. For one thing, eternal life, as experienced and interpreted by Christians, is primarily not life of endless duration: first and foremost it is life of a new and richer quality, which because of its nature must be everlasting. This is the consistent and unanimous meaning of the phrase in the New Testament: essentially, it is life, not of greater length than ordinary life, but of greater depth. Wherein does this new depth consist? It consists surely in the experience of fellowship with God in Jesus Christ; 'this is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent' (Jn 17^{3}).

So the first and most fundamental characteristic of life for the Christian in the world to come is this, that it will consist in fellowship with God in Christ, with all the blessedness which this will inevitably bring. Says the late Professor H. R. Mackintosh: 'The knowledge of God in which fellowship consists is also a personal enjoyment of Him. Love to God, in men made perfect, has no more to struggle with its opposite, and the heart at leisure from sin and selfishness must draw an unmingled gladness from that supreme communion. Not only so; but the knowledge and enjoyment of God, in a world where everything reveals Him, will refine and mould the soul in His very image. As in this life, we shall be changed by beholding; and if the receptivity of the beholders is become quite mature, both in capacity and will, then at last the glory of the divine nature will be mirrored truly in the children of the Father. To gaze on God is not a mere passive consciousness of God's presence but an active sharing in His mind and will' (*Immortality and the Future*, 234 f.).

This intimate relation to God will be the dominant fact in the life of the Christian beyond the grave. But it will not be all. For Christianity never conceives of God apart from that Kingdom of which He is the Head. John Wesley used to say that 'the Bible knows nothing of a solitary religion.' And the late Forbes Robinson in one of his letters says this: 'God has no private blessing for me apart from the rest of the family.' Hence, for the Christian, life in the world to come will be a life of fellowship not only with God, but likewise with the 'spirits of just men made perfect'—and particularly with those saints who, in Newman's well-remembered words, have been 'loved long since, and lost awhile.'

Moreover, this life will be one not of celestial idleness, but of harmonious and satisfying activity and service. Too often the life of the eternal world has been pictured as though it would consist in endless inactivity; as, for example, in the hymn which contains the verse

> When the day of toil is done,
> When the race of life is run,
> Father, grant Thy wearied one
> Rest for evermore,

or in the washerwoman's parting message:

> I'll be where loud anthems is always a-ringing,
> But as I've no voice, I'll be clear of the singing;
> Don't mourn for me now, don't mourn for me never,
> For I'm going to do nothing for ever and ever.

But it is coming to be realized that a more satisfying conception from the point of view of Christian faith is this, that the life to come will be one of activity, an activity, as Dr. John Baillie well says in his great book, *And the Life Everlasting*, 'which is essentially one of attainment rather than of progress; a growth *in* rather than *towards* that which is good' (p. 279). And Dr. Baillie goes on to illustrate this point by reference to recent discussion of the matter. For example, he quotes the concluding passage in W. R. Sorley's Gifford Lectures on *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, in which it is urged that it is possible to think of free spirits 'as, themselves made perfect, still pressing forward into new and untried ways, enhancing the values of the world. It is not only evil (that is, moral evil) that has to be mastered. The artist or the man of science has not been fighting against moral evil in his effort to produce things of beauty or to enlarge the sphere of knowledge; and yet he has been producing values. In this way it is conceivable that moral evil might be overcome, and yet that adventure would not cease. There would still be call and room for pressing further into the unknown and making all things subservient to the values which it is the function of free spirits to realize.' Such a conception of the life to come is wholly consistent with the teaching of Scripture, which makes it plain that 'His servants shall serve him' as well as 'see his face' (Rev $22^{3.4}$; cf. Rev 7^{15}).

The above discussion will perhaps have made it apparent, if only by implication, that eternal life is not something which is *entirely* reserved for life beyond the grave; rather, it is something of which Christians have a foretaste—real though imperfect and incomplete—in this present life. This they acquire through surrender to Jesus Christ, who is the Mediator of eternal life. This truth is emphasized throughout the New Testament, especially in the writings of the author of the Fourth Gospel (cf. Ro 14^{17}, Col $2^{12.13}$ $3^{1.2}$, Jn 24^{24-25}, 1 Jn 3^{14}); and it is a truth to which all subsequent Christian experience sets its seal. Therefore, as Dr. Baillie says, 'the real moment of transition to the new order of being is not the moment of physical death but the moment of spiritual rebirth. When in this life a man comes to know God, a far more radical change has taken place in his soul than will take place when he passes from this life with God on earth to the admittedly much fuller life with God in the world beyond' (*And the Life Everlasting*, 249 f.). Hence the preaching of the Christian hope for the world to come is inseparably bound up with the preaching of the gospel of God's grace in Jesus Christ, that heavenly grace which is sufficient not only here, but hereafter.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Never a Passenger.

By the Reverend John Wilding, B.A.,
King's Norton.

'They that go down to the sea in ships.'—Ps 107^{23}.

These are days when most of us take a close interest in what happens on the seas. Yet, how much do we know of life in a battleship, or a submarine, or a merchant vessel? Even if we have been all over such a ship in harbour, even if we have travelled across the ocean in a liner, we know little of life at sea.

In one of his writings called *The Mirror of the Sea* Joseph Conrad describes the adventures of a steamer which lost a propeller and then drifted out of the track of ships. In the tale he shows that it was a very different experience for the crew from what it was for the passengers. Then he asks the question, 'Does a passenger ever feel the life of a ship in which he is being carried? . . . For *a man who has never been a passenger* it is impossible to say.'

Conrad was a man who had never been a passenger. Before he was a writer he was a ship's officer and he knew the hardships of life at sea from a sailor's point of view. When he became a writer he was never a passenger. He worked terribly hard and produced no shoddy work. All he had he earned.

What a description to be able to pin on to one's self—'a man, a woman, a boy, a girl who has never been a passenger.'

Could you wear that label at *home*? Perhaps your father or mother could answer that question better than you could. You may say that you help

with the odd jobs. Good. But do you also help with the cheerfulness and kindliness? To the happiness of home we must all contribute. We cannot be passengers on that ship, leaving all the work to others.

Could you wear that label at *worship*? Some folk come to church and expect to find everything ready and never think of having anything to do for themselves. When we come here, we none of us come to be carried as passengers. The hymns are for all to sing, the prayers for all to mean, the Bible for all to hear. In this place there is what St. Paul once called, 'a fellowship of giving and receiving.' Don't forget the giving, or you will be only a passenger.

Could you wear that label out in the *town* to-day? Here we sit, quiet and safe, and even at this moment men are in danger of losing their lives for us. Are we passengers being carried through storms and past rocks by their skill and pluck and sacrifice? I would hate to be only a passenger to-day. When we think how much is being done for us, there is only one response. It is to give and do all we can every day, to do our best, to do our work well and willingly, to put up with a few restrictions cheerfully. You and I must live to repay our debt to these other men and women.

It would, then, be a fine label to wear invisibly night and day, 'a man who has never been a passenger.' It would be even a finer thing to deserve it.

The Ugly Duckling.

By the Reverend R. S. Eldridge, B.A., Stratford-on-Avon.

'Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty.'—Is 33^{17}.

Once upon a time there was a girl who was ugly but who wanted to be beautiful. She knew she was ugly; for she spent much time looking at herself in the glass, and it always gave her a pain. Her hair was straight, and she had a snub nose and freckles. She had once tried to improve her appearance, painting her lips a brilliant red and powdering her face, but her brother told her bluntly that it made her look more ghastly than ever, and sadly for once she agreed with him.

Then she read somewhere that good thoughts and kind deeds made a person look beautiful and decided she might as well give it a trial. For the next fortnight she was a model girl. She got up early in the morning and gave mother and father a cup of tea in bed. She threaded dozens of needles for grandmother whose sight was not very good. Money she might have spent on sweets, she put in her missionary box. She went to church three times on Sunday and was as full of helpfulness as she knew how to be. Then, after two weeks, she had another good look at herself in the glass. 'Hm, I *knew* it wouldn't work!' was all she said. True enough, her hair was as straight as ever, her nose as snubbed, and her face as full of freckles. It was quite hopeless and she went to bed depressed.

That night she dreamed a dream. Suddenly her room was full of heavenly light and there was an Angel standing by her bed. Never before had she seen a being quite so lovely and for a long time she was speechless, only wanting to stare and stare and stare. Then at last, thinking this must seem rather rude, she blushed and said: 'Excuse me, but are you an angel?' 'I am *your* angel,' was the reply in the most musical voice she had ever heard. 'I didn't know I had an angel,' said the girl, 'but I'm glad; for you are so beautiful. I wonder what it feels like to be beautiful. If I were beautiful, instead of being ugly, I think I'd be admiring myself in the glass all day long!' At this the angel laughed, the merriest laugh ever heard on earth: 'Why, we have no mirrors in Heaven,' she said, 'and if we had we'd never look in them. We are all so busy. Our joy is to behold the lovely face of our Master and flash to do His bidding. Once you have seen *Him* you forget all about yourself.'

'I wish I could see Him,' said the girl with a sigh. 'Is He very beautiful?' 'See Him you *shall* if you look for Him hard enough. You will find His beauty everywhere in the world—in flowers and trees and green fields, in His House on Sunday as you sing His praise, in the Bible as you seek His will; you will see Him every time you do a kindly thing through love of Him. Love Him, obey Him, and look out for Him: then you will see Him!' Then the angel kissed her freckled forehead and was gone.

The world did seem lovelier after that. The flowers had never been so gay in her eyes. The birds had never sung so sweetly. In church there was a new gladness as she sang hymns in praise of Jesus Christ, and when she read the old stories of Jesus, it was just as if she had never really noticed how grand and good they were before. She wore her prettiest frocks because she wanted to look her best for His sake, and to brighten the lives of others, and everything she tried to do for love of Him. If she never saw Him with her bodily eyes, she knew what the angel meant. She knew He was near her—particularly did she feel this when she

was threading grandma's needles or helping some one for His sake. It was for Him. It was to please Him.

And a wonderful thing happened, although she was not aware of it—her appearance actually changed! Oh yes, she still had hair that obstinately refused to curl, but no one noticed it. It didn't seem to matter. People looked at her eyes instead, and what merry, honest, kindly eyes they were! And as for her nose and freckles, they only made her face look jollier, especially when she laughed. She really had something of the beauty of Jesus whom she loved.

I don't suppose any of us is really ugly, though we could all be more beautiful. True it is that the loveliest people in the world are those who are so full of Jesus that something of His glory shines in their faces and beautifies all they say and do. 'Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us!'

A Prayer of Intercession.

O God who art high and lifted up yet condescendest to hear the prayers of them that seek Thee with devout and humble hearts grant us to be sure of the great things wrought by prayer as now we remember our fellows before Thee.

God of the Nations, who of Thy mercy hast vouchsafed Thy presence to our land in days past we commend our country unto Thee, God of our fathers and Lord of our choice. Preserve the persons of our King and Queen, that we, being constrained by their example, may continue to place our confidence in Thee. Strengthen the whole company of our people, and all who are associated with us, for the doing and the bearing of Thy will. Give wisdom to all who direct our country's affairs, that they, being enlightened of Thee, may lead us through the darkness into the light and joy of peace. Casting all care upon Thee, may they and we find Thee our strength every morning and our rest each evening time.

O God who alone canst strengthen us to face what life may ask of us we commend unto Thee all of whom much is required in these troubled days. Protect all who protect us and all they and we hold dear; save from dangers, known and unforeseen, our sailors and our fishermen, bringing them to the haven where they would be; comfort and sustain all who dwell where the violence of our enemies has been experienced and all who, being separated from such friends, are concerned for their safety; strengthen all who guard against fire and who give succour in disaster; give courage and the companionship of loyal friends to all who have suffered the loss of loved ones or of possessions and comfort such with Thine own presence.

O Thou whose peace passeth all understanding; hear us for those who stand in need of the gift Thou alone canst bestow. We pray for all patients in hospitals, infirmaries, and nursing homes; for all whom present conditions have made nervous, excited, and afraid; for all who cannot sleep, and all who find concentration on their daily task difficult; for all who are aged and who have been deprived of a peaceful eventide, and for those who in business carry a heavy burden of anxiety. O God, who knowest us all by name and the difficulties with which each must contend, of Thy mercy hear our prayer for all whom we have named before Thee.

God of all comfort, who comfortest men that they comfort one another in any time of need we would remember those who are endeavouring to minister comfort and courage to others; all who have welcomed to their homes the homeless and the dispossessed; all who, in Thy name, remind their fellows of the things that cannot be shaken; all doctors and nurses engaged in their gracious ministry of healing; all teachers to whom children look for understanding and sympathy; all poets, artists, and musicians by whose work our tension is sometimes relieved and our care-laden hearts made lighter.

O Thou who desirest that men should live in unity and concord; grant that our prayer for the peace of Thy world may be heard and answered of Thee. Shorten the time of our trial, we beseech Thee, and hasten the day when all men shall be gathered in one fold under one Shepherd, even Jesus Christ. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

RODERICK BETHUNE.

Aberdeen.

The Christian Year.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Mystery of the One Good Man.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

'And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake.'—Gn 18^{32}.

'For I will defend this city, to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake.'—2 K 19^{34}.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the world struggle is not a struggle between this and

that nation, or between one ideology and another: it is a conflict between good and evil. Which of these two contending forces is the stronger—good or evil? That is what every one wants to know to-day. Two answers are being given to this question, and each answer is the logical conclusion derived from the facts. What, then, are the facts?

1. First, here is a handful of facts chosen at random:

In 1939 Konrad Heiden published a book called *One Man Against Europe*. If that title were re-written to-day it might well be worded 'One Man Against the World.' Let us put that fact into figures. The population of the world is said to be about two thousand millions. According to recent information (*Penguin Polit. Dict.*, Dec., 1939) the membership of the Nazi Party is no more than three millions. And yet — Which is the stronger, good or evil? The figures seem to speak for themselves.

In my basket there are twenty apples and one of them is rotten. What will happen in time? Will the nineteen good ones transmit their virtue to the one bad apple and convert it into a good one?

Why do children pick up bad habits and naughty words more readily than they do good ones? Bacon tells us why: 'For ill, to man's nature as it stands perverted, hath a natural motion, strongest in continuance.'

'An act by which we make one friend and one enemy,' wrote the English parson, Caleb Colton, 'is a losing game, because revenge is a much stronger principle than gratitude.' And the German, Wilhelm Schaefer, would agree with him: 'A drop of hate sticks more tenaciously than all the love in the world.' And so one might continue.

But let us take the long view. What of the contagious power of good and evil when handed down from generation to generation? Let Shakespeare's Antony speak:

> The evil that men do lives after them,
> The good is oft interred with their bones.

Nor are the men of the Bible unaware of the ugly side of the law of retribution: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.'

So much for the evidence. What is the verdict? Undoubtedly, the logical conclusion based upon such facts is that, of the two, evil is the stronger.

2. Let us now turn to another group of facts.

(*a*) Abraham was a good man. He was called the friend of God. There was a certain city in which he was personally interested (he had a nephew living there), the city of Sodom. And that populous city was a sink of corruption. Abraham wants to know how much goodness would be required to counteract and conquer all that matted mass of evil. He puts the question to God. With engaging simplicity he asks God how many good men would be necessary to save Sodom from its doom. Would fifty be enough? Yes, that would be ample. 'And the Lord said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes.' Abraham is pleased, but not satisfied. He lowers the figure by five at a time, and as his number of good men dwindles he grows more and more apologetic until, at last, he reaches the number ten. God reassures him, however, and tells him that ten good men would be enough. 'I will not destroy it for ten's sake.'

But why stop at ten? Apparently Abraham is too modest to ask too much. Any number of good men, less than ten, Abraham thinks, would be a minority far too small to have any effect upon the evil incarnate in all those thousands of corrupt Sodomites. What a pity Abraham did not continue the conversation. Let us try to do so. 'Forgive my persistence,' Abraham goes on, 'but I do so much want to know. What if there were only one good man amongst all those evil men, would the goodness of one man have any effect at all?' And God answers: 'Yes! One good man would make all the difference in the world. I will not destroy it for one's sake.' And while Abraham was turning this over in his mind and wondering what to say next, God breaks in and says to him: 'Abraham, why don't *you* be that *one*? If I had one good man like you as my agent and witness in Sodom there would be hope for Sodom even yet.' 'Oh,' you say, 'but that's all imagination. That's all made up.' Not at all. I am simply applying a principle that is worked out not only in the Bible but in all history, the principle, namely, that the moral leaven of one good man can and does possess enough vitality to counteract and to conquer the evil of a whole community and to save it from destruction. This is the principle that sent Chalmers to New Guinea, Paton to the New Hebrides and Schweitzer to the primeval forest. These, and countless others, are winged with that self-same power of God who sent His Son into the world that the world through Him might be saved. It is the

great missionary principle—that to be alone with God is to be in the majority.

(*b*) Jerusalem is threatened with invasion by Sennacherib. Not only is there danger from without, there is corruption within. 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die.' Could anything, could any amount of goodness, avail to counteract all that mass of feebleness and corruption? Here is God's answer to Isaiah: 'I will save this city, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake.' One man! One good man! 'For my servant David's sake.' But David was not there! David had been dead and gone these three hundred years! What could it mean? Among other things, surely this: that the moral force of one good man, filtering down through thirty decades, is strong enough, is vital enough, actively to influence the course of history for good after the lapse of three hundred years.

(*c*) In the Parable of the Sower the harmful weeds seem to come up more or less in the natural course of things. But in the Parable of the Tares there are hints of something far more sinister and malign. While the good man and his helpers are asleep the wicked man comes and poisons the crop on purpose. There is an appalling amount of deliberate devilry being done in the world to-day, and many people are asking why God allows such a state of affairs to continue. A few judicious adjustments here and there by the over-ruling Providence would make a world of difference. Why not take up the tares for the good of the wheat? Why does God not remove 'this wicked man,' or that, so as to give men of good will and upholders of good causes a chance? The answer is that, if it were necessary, He would no doubt do so. But it does not appear to be necessary. That is Jesus' answer. There is in goodness, just because it is goodness, enough potency to overcome the world's evil, however malignant and overpowering that evil, at any time and in any form, may seem to be.

3. Let us sum up. Facts, like figures, may be made to prove anything. But selected facts can never reach the truth; only all the facts can do that. That man is blind who sees no evil in the world to-day, but blinder still is he who sees nothing but evil. The first group of facts led logically to the conclusion that evil is stronger than good. But one vital piece of evidence was missing. It was the fact of God—that God is, and that God is at work. Now bring God in. Admit God as evidence. That is done in the second group. All the facts are there, including the fact of God.

Why does Jesus say that the tares can be left to grow among the wheat? Why is it true, in spite of the apparently overwhelming forces of evil at work in the world to-day, that goodness, without any miraculous removals, will triumph? It is because the world is God's field, and God is in the field watching His crop.

What grounds have we for believing that, if God had had in Sodom one good man like Abraham, there would have been hope for Sodom and all its evil population? Why can the Bible declare that the bequeathed goodness of a consecrated life like David's is potent and active after the lapse of three centuries? It is because both Abraham and David were in the line of succession. They were in the main current of the divine purpose. And so are you, and so am I, and so is every man who is a friend of God and a fellow-worker with God. Wherever goodness appears, whether in you or in me, God becomes responsible for it and guarantees its triumph.

A friend of mine, the manager of a hosiery factory, said to Bill the stoker the other day: 'Bill,' he said, 'don't you think it's wonderful—the way we are prospering in these days?' 'Yes,' said Bill, straightening himself, 'somebody's holding the banner up.' 'What do you mean by that?' asked my friend. 'Well, it's like this,' said Bill. 'I reckon somebody's praying for this country.' My friend pondered for a moment, and then it suddenly dawned upon him. 'Great God,' he broke out, '*that might be me*!'

'It all depends on me. And I depend on God.' That is the mystery, and the miracle, of the one good man.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Two Aspects.

'Without father, without mother, without descent . . . but made like unto the Son of God.'—He 7^{3}.

'We have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.'—He 4^{15} (R.V.).

In our Lord Jesus Christ there were two characteristics which, even at the first, caught the attention of men and which have always given Him power. On the one hand there was a certain unearthliness of nature, as of a man unlike his fellows and encompassed by an atmosphere of mystery and awe. This finds expression in the Fourth Gospel (3^{13}) where He is described as having come down out of heaven and yet being in heaven—He was living on this common earth and sharing in its experience, and yet He conveyed the sugges-

tion of having His true life elsewhere. But not less pronounced was the other impression of a rich and cordial humanity, for everything that touched His fellows found in Him a quick response. If He was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, without father or mother or descent, one solitary exception in our race, He was not less a man tempted in all points like as we are, and touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Throughout the Church's record these two facts have made their appeal, and whenever either of them has been ignored the Church's energy has declined.

1. These two aspects of His nature are already obvious in the Gospel records. Our Lord Jesus Christ was a true man, made of a woman, as Paul says, and tracing His descent from the royal house. There have been periods in the life of the Church when theologians and preachers have been so eager in contending that He was more than man as almost to forget that, at least, He was man. They confessed that He was born in Bethlehem, but they did not care to dwell upon this, as the whole idea of childhood, with its helplessness and its need of growth, was a bewilderment and almost an offence to them. In the Apocryphal Gospels of the Childhood, Jesus is represented as already armed with omnipotence and divine knowledge, not needing to grow, as Luke says He did, in wisdom as well as in stature. And until comparatively recent times Jesus remained in the teaching of the Church much more as a dogma and a Heavenly Visitor and Official than as a man with realizable human associations. The effect of this one-sided teaching was to set Jesus beyond our reach. It is because our High Priest can be touched, and was touched with the feeling of our infirmities that we can come boldly and find the help we need.

It was not in one point only, as the Gospels show, that the disciples were conscious of this, for there were wide regions of experience and of feeling in which they found Him more richly human than themselves. They could say, 'We were scornful and impatient, but to Him little children were no encumbrance in His talk: He was welcomed by gay and reckless people on whom we looked with shy hostility: He had an eye for flowers and birds, and He taught us always to look out rather than in. We saw Him weeping when His friend had died, and, when the nails were driven through His hands, we heard Him praying for His executioners: even on the Cross He had thought for the future of His mother, for His was a true human heart.'

But this did not end their witness. They had begun with frank admiration and hero-worship for a Man sent from God, wiser, mightier, holier than any they had known, but before they were aware of it they found themselves out of their depth. They had fancied that they knew Him because they could repeat the names of His brothers, and knew His trade and His domicile, but abruptly it seemed as if He had withdrawn Himself and were speaking from another level of authority, and breathing another air. It is not possible attentively to read any of the Gospels without recognizing this element of separateness in the character of Jesus. Something there was in Him which availed to bring men to their knees, and drew from them tears of penitence and stern deeds of sacrificial obedience, so that when He said 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' sin-burdened men and women heard more than the voice of a Man: they saw the heavens opened and, in the face of Jesus, they saw the goodness of God coming to welcome them.

2. These two aspects continue to appear in the influence of Jesus throughout history. The historian Lecky complains that 'among Christians the ideal figures have commonly been of such a nature as to isolate them from human sympathies. The saints dwell apart, whereas among the Greeks and Romans the examples of virtue were found in men who had lived in the same moral atmosphere, struggled for the same ends, and exhibited the same national characteristics as their admirers.' Now in so far as Lecky's account of the saints is just we should have to confess a preference for the Greek and Roman rule. Our best help comes from those who have trodden the common ways and have found victory possible even there; but this is exactly what the Apostles and their wiser successors found most heartening in the example of Jesus. He accepted the universal lot, claiming no exemption, and it is because He suffered being tempted that He has been able to succour those who are tempted. The place which the Virgin has come to hold in the devotion of good Romans is an evidence of how natural such a craving is. For centuries Jesus, in His humanity, had been withdrawn from His Church: He was presented to men either on the Cross, or as wholly divine—as the Judge clothed with terrible majesty. Above the great door by which the people streamed into the Cathedral, they saw His image carved, an inflexible figure, with hand uplifted to condemn and dismiss the erring, and year after year this deepened its impression. What their hearts needed was Someone who knew the meaning of life and love and death, of motherhood and hope and conquering patience, and since these were not even suggested in the effigy of Jesus they

were sought for in His mother. It was foolish, no doubt, and unworthy, but it was wholly natural, for the heart knows its own bitterness, and it cries after some one who can understand. To an acquaintance Charles Lamb confessed that he had long been sorely dispirited, 'and these are things which to you must be of faith, for who can understand depression?' Even a friend, he felt, must remain outside if he had not trodden the same dreary path.

But this, however welcome to the heart, is only part of the truth, and much modern preaching about Jesus has failed because it spoke of nothing else than this. Many preachers have earned the scathing criticism applied to Southey's *Life of Wesley*—'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.' The heart of man, when really stirred, has its noble reserves and self-respect, and it refuses to delude itself with sentiment or with painted words. Deep calleth unto deep, the sense of tragic defect and vacancy calls aloud for fullness and sufficiency; and to find in Jesus nothing more than a graciously human and understanding Figure is less than enough. Our hearts ask for the assurance that in Him we are actually in contact, life with life, with the Eternal God: our deep desire is not that our faults should be understood and condoned, but that they should be healed.

3. On this it follows that, if the Church's work is to prosper, these two aspects must ever be proclaimed. By our lack of geniality and of hopefulness, and by the ghostly and unpractical quality of much, both of our preaching and of our prayers, we must often have repelled people who, in a true sense, had a mind towards God. We all need to be baptized into what Paul calls 'the philanthropy of God'—His unfeigned interest in the creatures He has fashioned.

But, on the other hand, the Church, since it is Christ's body and a supernatural creation, is bound at all times to show itself as of the order of Melchizedek. In spite of gibes and jeers men still are ready to confess the dignity of an unworldly life. Men can be helped and transformed by the Church only when the majesty of God is in her message and obedience to God is in her people. For this honour has been put upon us by our Master that in the Church we are called to have a share both in His understanding sympathy and in His heavenly life; for 'He has given to us exceeding great and precious promises that by them we should be made partakers of the Divine nature, and escape the corruption that is in the world by lust.'[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 11.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Pride.

'Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.'—Mt 26^{25}.

The betrayal of Jesus was no sudden act of passion or weakness; it demanded foresight and cool resolve. Jesus saw it coming, and Himself in the end gently but decisively forced the issue. In the end Jesus Christ always does present a decisive issue to men. That was what Simeon perceived, an old man enlightened by the Spirit, when he said, 'Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against . . . that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.' That is what the writer to the Hebrews, enlightened by the same spirit, meant when he wrote, '. . . the word is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' And is this not the supreme need of us men and women—so dilatory as we are, so preoccupied with every question but the last question of all, so deeply afraid of God and yet so haunted by the thought of God—is this not our supreme need, to be brought into that critical pass where we must decide what we are and where we stand, and so be done with the life of make-shift and make-believe?

What kind of man was Judas Iscariot who turned traitor? What can fairly be judged of him from the records? It was in him to be an apostle of Christ. It does not bear thinking that Christ called him for any other reason. Like the other eleven, he was an ordinary man with his own particular personal history, his own endowments, his own weaknesses and sins. Like the other eleven and every other son of man, he knew the tension of moral striving and the sting of moral failure, knew also, through all, the incessant calling of God to his soul. He would seem to have been a prominent figure in the company of the apostles, especially in the earlier days of our Lord's ministry. He was made treasurer of the little group, the trustee of its common fund. Once, in St. Mark's Gospel (14^{10}), he is referred to as 'the one of the twelve,' a phrase in dispute among grammarians, but which may possibly mean 'the principal one, the leader, of the twelve.' These are slender hints, but, viewed in the light of the whole story, they help to make it credible that at first Judas was looked on as the

most promising, because the ablest, of the apostles. What happened in the heart of this man to produce the deed of treachery and the final act of despair by which he is remembered?

We know from St. John that he was dishonest. He was not quite straight and so could not be quite candid and free in fellowship. Dishonesty and secrecy go hand in hand; when men's thoughts and deeds are evil they must keep chambers locked against their friends. We may fairly picture Judas as a man with a place of his own in the group about Jesus, respected for his ability, but standing a little apart, not the best of mixers, a man of a certain reserve which made the ingenuous a little uncomfortable and the experienced a little suspicious.

We know again that Judas betrayed his Master for money, and when that is put alongside the fact of his pilfering, it looks as though he loved money. Few men love money for its own sake; but few men do not love those things of which money is the symbol and to which it opens the way—pleasure, security, privilege, power. If Judas were such a man, the early days of Christ's public ministry would be proud days for him; the applause of the Galilean crowds would be as incense in his nostrils; the better side of him would be deeply stirred by that mission from which, with the other apostles, he returned with joy to report that even the devils were subject to him.

But the issue of the public work of Christ begins to take definite shape, and with it the private issue of the destiny of Judas. Clouds begin to gather; official opposition to harden; popularity to wane. Christ's teaching becomes more direct and piercing; He speaks of humility as the gateway of His kingdom, and suffering and death as the road to His coronation. I believe that of all the twelve, Judas best understood what Jesus meant, and that a fierce and bitter struggle was provoked in his soul. A mean little maggot of a sin like pilfering, an open and honest enough ambition to hold high place in the Messianic Kingdom—these do not finally differentiate a Judas from a Simon or a John. They too were ambitious, they too had their own weaknesses and sins. But there is a mortar which binds sins together and makes them immovable; a last stronghold, the keep of the fortress which man holds against God, in which sin has its fighting headquarters. It is pride. Pride is knowledge of right and continuance in wrong. Pride is sin become conscious and remaining impenitent. Pride is the dark impulse of self-will which, when wrong has been recognized as wrong, still prompts to persevere in wrong, to do so at all costs rather than stoop and acknowledge wrong and forsake it. Pride is the devil in the inmost recess of the soul, sometimes sullen and cynical, sometimes dressed in dignity, sometimes masquerading under the guise of shyness or the sense of inferiority, always lonely, always touchy, always critical, always divisive. Stripped of all its disguises and seen for what it truly is, pride is the ego facing God and recognizing Him as God and defying Him.

Time and again, at first in trivial contexts perhaps, two voices debated in the heart of Judas. The first said, 'Jesus is right and I am wrong'; the second immediately protested, 'I am Judas, and I will not put myself in the wrong.' In larger and larger contexts, with ever clearer definition and ever increasing tension, the struggle goes forward, and still more plainly the two voices speak in his soul. 'Jesus is right, grandly right, divinely right.' 'I am Judas, a man with a known point of view, a man of established reputation for this and that way of speaking and acting; I will not disown myself, not yet at any rate, not before Peter at any rate. . . .' And with each affirmation of the self over against Jesus there crept gradually in the desire to wound, which crystallized at length in the idea of betrayal. Who knows how often he thrust the thought from his mind in self-disgust, to what extent it was an open question in a distracted mind to the very last?

Perhaps some day a painter of genius will take as his subject the scene of the foot-washing, and make central to it Jesus kneeling at the feet of Judas. Such a picture would present a profound symbol of the wonder of the love of God to man, and of the dark mystery of the resistance of man to God. 'Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.' 'If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them.' Judas knew these things, but he would not stoop to do them. We all know the dark sequel.

To conclude this sombre study with three observations. The first is that through the whole story of the Passion, and not least in relation to the part played by Judas, there sounds a mysterious undertone like a deep bourdon note breathing below tragic music. It is the note of necessity, the sense that the whole scene of human life is governed from beyond its own borders, the sense of a constraining purpose which the will of man may defy but not finally thwart. So far as Judas is concerned, it means that all the time he was free to refuse to be God's servant, but never for one moment was

he free to refuse to be God's instrument. So great is Almighty God; so little, so very little is a man.

The second is this: that our destiny is being shaped day by day according as we do or disobey the will of God. How scrupulous every man ought to be who handles trust funds! How little importance ought any man to attach to mere external closeness to Christ! There is always a direct road from the Upper Chamber to the act of betrayal, and beyond it to self-destruction. That road is pride, the hard impenitence of pride.

But lastly this; lastly and always this. We live in the day of God's grace. Christ is risen. Christ is alive. His accomplished passion pleads for ever with our pride. His resurrection pledges for ever the power and love of the Heavenly Father to the penitent sinner.[1]

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Inadequate Companions, yet Welcome.

'Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.'—Jn 15^{15}.

What is a friend but one who receives a man on the same footing, and treats him as an equal? But if the one has a rich, powerful mind or a commanding personality, the other cannot avoid the feeling sometimes of being an inadequate companion, and perhaps his sense of inferiority makes the politely supposed equality rather unreal.

Sir Edward Grey wrote in a letter to Lady Lyttelton in 1908, that he had spent two nights at Wimbledon with John Morley, and this is how he described the visit. 'It was very good to be with a mind which has voyaged so far and long through seas of thought, and I enjoyed it, fearing however, the while, that I could not be an adequate companion. I feel quite proud whenever I tell him anything which makes him light up and laugh.' That shows the fine modesty of Edward Grey, and if one great man felt so humble when admitted to the friendship of another great man, how much more humble and reverent must people feel when they are admitted to friendship with Christ! There can be no equality between Him and us, because He is far above the level of poor, weak humanity, and we sometimes have a misgiving that our hankering after Him is as impossible of fulfilment as 'the desire of the moth for a star.' But He has come near to us, into the thick of our struggles and sins, and He does not shrink from identifying Himself with us and sharing His thoughts with us. We may be most inadequate companions, conscious of being far beneath Him, but 'he is not ashamed to call us brethren.'

'Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth.' Christ tells those who are attracted to Him that they need not feel out of their depth, as if they were plunged into matters too deep for them, and were sinking in some unplumbed mystery. They must not imagine that devotion to Him is beyond their comprehension and exclaim wistfully, 'Oh, we give it up!' Why, they are not like servants obeying orders whose meaning and purpose they do not understand. They are friends who have been taken into confidence by Christ. He has let them into His secret, shared His thoughts and aims with them, and communicated to them the truth. They know His insights and His intentions. 'I have call you friends: for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.'

Inadequate companions they might be meanwhile, but they must share His ideals and His faith in the Father, they must assimilate the truth He revealed and absorb His spirit. So they were welcome in His company. This was great news to the early Christians, many of whom belonged to the slave class and who had been accustomed to do what they were told without sharing their master's secret.

'I have called you friends,' that is 'I have given you the same vision of God and of human destiny as I have.' There may be friendship between a man of faith and a man of no faith. Balzac describes the intimacy between the Abbé Chaperon and Dr. Minoret, and says, 'The man of God was the only man who could understand the atheist. Each hated the other's opinions, but esteemed each other's character. Contrariety of characters, not antagonism of opinions, is what gives rise to antipathies. So the Abbé Chaperon was the doctor's first friend at Nemours. When on great occasions the Abbé had to receive his subordinate clergy and other curés, a duty that falls on the head of a district, he borrowed silver and table-linen from his friend the atheist. "My plate is working out its salvation," the doctor would say.' Such a friendship has a piquant interest, and may sometimes help the unbeliever to approximate to belief. There is no reason why two persons should not be friends because the one has religious faith and the other has not, indeed such a companionship may open blind eyes that they may see. But friendship with Christ is different, because its condition is that the

[1] A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 23.

same mind be in us which was in Christ Jesus. It is impossible to be a friend of His by admiring His character but hating His views, His doctrine of God and of man's relation to God in prayer and worship, and brushing these aside as of no importance. There *is* an approach to Christ by feeling the pull of His example and His moral teaching, but it can develop into an understanding friendship only by the attitude which says, 'Lord I believe, help thou mine unbelief.' There must be self-surrender to Christ, an opening of the mind to learn from a superior mind, a humble willingness to be impressed and convinced. The morality of Christ cannot be separated from His theology, for His example and His ethic have a religious basis. He tells people to respect and love each other because every one is dear to God, who is the Father of all, and the Divine Fatherhood should touch and incline them to fulfil the obligations of brotherhood.

To admire Christ's character and moral principles while rejecting His views on God is to expect a plant which has been torn up by the roots to blossom and thrive and fill the house of life with its fragrance. No, friendship with Christ is impossible unless there is a desire to know more, to believe more, to share His mind on God as well as on the duties of man to his fellows. Christ wishes to communicate His standpoint to us and to reveal to us all that the Father has revealed to Him. That is what friendship with Him means, and we begin it by self-surrender, by personal attachment to Him, that we may grasp His meaning; and His meaning is that He brings the truth, the love, and power of God into human experience to transform it. We are all imperfect friends of Christ, with defective sympathy and faltering response. Some are incomplete Christians in their creed and some are incomplete Christians in their conduct. Are there not many who go only part of the way with Christ? We are all inadequate companions of Christ, and yet we are welcome in His company.

'I call you not servants: but I have called you friends.' What Christ asks is not an unreasoning and mechanical obedience but an intelligent and sympathetic attachment. So He did not give to those around Him a closed system of thought, a rigid code, a fixed set of regulations to be slavishly adhered to, but a vision and a spirit which would awaken their whole nature. Was it a heroic mistake to choose poor human clay to hold the flame of eternal truth, such earthen vessels to keep the light of heaven burning through the ages with their varying problems?

Take an instance of how a man is inspired when he is trusted in a great cause. Abraham Lincoln chose and believed in James Grant as an army leader, when Grant was a rough, dissipated person, who had been at West Point and had fought in the Mexican War, but had retired from military service, had 'failed at farming and other ventures, and at thirty-nine, when the Civil War began, was a shabby-looking, shiftless fellow, pretty far gone in the habit of drink, and more or less occupied about a leather business of his father's.' Not a promising commander surely, yet Lincoln trusted him, and treated him more like a friend than a subordinate, because Grant was a sincere man who believed in the cause of the Union and shared Lincoln's conviction that the cause could win and must win at all costs. So Lincoln had complete faith in this man who held the same views, and Lincoln's faith in him pulled Grant together and roused all the dormant possibilities of his manhood. To be trusted made a different man of him, and as the War went on, Lincoln put still more confidence in him and raised him to greater responsibilities, till Grant became Commander-in-chief of the Federal Armies, and won victory for the north, and was finally elected President of the United States. This is an instance of how a man who is going to waste may be rallied and transformed into a conquering hero by his master's brave faith in him. James Grant was not merely a mechanical servant but a trusted friend who shared the outlook and aims of his chief, and that mobilized the hidden forces of his nature and carried him to triumph.

'I have called you friends.' We may be inadequate companions, yet we are welcome in Christ's company. He wants us, He believes in us, He has high expectations of what we can become once we are charged with the dynamic powers of His spirit, and He can lift our life into bigger dimensions. Do we want Him and do we respond to His voice which keeps calling through the bright days and through the dark nights of our experience: 'Come, I have called you friends.'? Friendship with Him is the chance of a life-time. Do not miss it.[1]

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Other Point of View.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. RAE, D.D., EDINBURGH.

'I sat where they sat.'—Ezk 3^{15}.

One of the most precious gifts with which God has endowed man is that of imagination. It is a possession shared by us all. Some people, indeed,

[1] A. A. COWAN, *Captain of the Storm*, 83.

possess more of it than others, or at least more of a certain kind.

> The lunatic, the lover, and the poet,
> Are of imagination all compact:
> One sees more devils than vast hell can hold,
> That is the madman; the lover, all as frantic,
> Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt:
> The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
> Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;
> And, as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.

But the lunatic, the lover, and the poet have no monopoly of this power. We are all engaged all the time in making pictures—in which often we figure as the chief character, to our great credit!

Now God has given us this endowment for two purposes. First, for pleasure. That is where the poet and the artist function. But also for *life*. We cannot live a decent life, still less can we live a Christian life, without the use of the imagination. You must sit where the other man sits if you are to be just to him or to help him.

1. Let us begin with Ezekiel. He was sent to the exiles, to preach to them. But he was a failure at first, because he did not understand them and they did not understand him. God told him, therefore, to go and live with the people, till he understood their language and their point of view and their needs. And when he did so his ministry became a powerful one. It was one of the main influences that put heart and endurance into the exiles, and enabled them to carry on till the day of their deliverance.

There is a lesson for the Church in this. We shall never reach the outsider unless we sit where he sits, unless we see his point of view and regard the Church as he does. It is no good simply condemning him as too critical or as unspiritual or as cantankerous. Let us get inside his skin and regard the Church, its members, its ministers, its officials. How do they all appear to an impartial observer? There is no doubt that the inconsistencies, the poverty of character, the almost total absence of anything that can be connected with Christ, on the part of many Church people are a stumbling block to candid and sincere people who judge an institution by its fruits. If we sat where the outsider sits we should have more sympathy with him, and therefore more chance of winning him, and we should begin to realize what witnessing for Christ really means.

2. But the value of this gift may be seen in other directions. It is supremely necessary in home life. For in the home two generations meet, and often clash. The parent has his own standards which he prizes as almost sacrosanct. They represent the wisdom of the older generation. They stand for decency and right living. Why should they not be good enough for his children? Why should his son wish to spend his time in frivolity or pleasure instead of 'sitting down with a book'? But the children have a different point of view. They belong to a new age, with its own standards, which are not necessarily inferior to the older though they are different. And the two generations fail to agree. There are strained relations. The home life is sometimes anything but happy. The place which should be the most kindly and gracious on earth becomes a place of dispeace and unease.

What is needed is the exercise of a Christian imagination. If the parent tried to put himself in the son's place and see his own generation with the son's eyes the strain at least would be eased. And if the son realized something of what the experience and wisdom of the past bring with them, as well as something of the debt he owes to his parents, there would be a sweeter atmosphere in the home. The secret of home happiness is a loving considerateness which is the essence of practical Christianity. For considerateness is just the exercise of imagination in the common affairs of daily life. And there is nothing that so intimately and really embodies the very spirit of Christ as that.

3. Pursuing the same truth in another direction, we find in this faculty the real inspiration to *social reform*. One at once thinks of very definite ways in which the Christian carries out his principles in social life, which can hardly be dignified by such a title. The treatment of shop assistants, to take a clamant case. They have a difficult job, dealing with all sorts of people and all sorts of needs. A popular writer says somewhere that if you show a woman a hat, a costume, or a man, she says, 'show me something else'! At any rate customers are often 'difficult,' and it is not easy to live up to the imperious generalization that 'the customer is always right.' We can make the work of those who serve us easier and their lot a little happier by some considerateness, by sitting where they sit, by realizing to some extent the special difficulties they have to face and avoiding adding to them.

But that is a matter of individual duty in a special case. What the text suggests is the powerful stimulus to social betterment generally that the use of the imagination would give. Which of us could think with patience of the housing conditions in our large cities if we put ourselves in the place of those who have to live in such conditions. Which of us could fail to be unhappy and restless and dissatisfied if we got inside the skin of an unemployed man? These, and other great social evils, persist because ordinary decent people will not use their imagination. How would *you* like to live without work? without something into which you could put your brain and interest and energy? These things go on because people will not sit where others sit. If we did as Ezekiel did, we should feel that at any cost these evils of unemployment, bad housing, extreme poverty, a starved life *must* not continue. We should find them intolerable. We should be so fired by what we have learned that we should create a public opinion that would cleanse the ways of our social system, and bring Christian standards and values to bear upon all our education and commerce and industry.

4. It is not too much, I hope, to see in the present world tragedy an opportunity for applying this truth. After the war will come the problem of reconstruction. It is important that we should regard this as a world-problem, the formation of a system in which *all* nations will have a place. However much we hate and despise Nazism, we shall have to live in the world with the German people. We are told (and it is probably true) that the virus of Nazism has deeply penetrated the German nation, and that we are fighting not merely Nazism but Germany. But even so, it is essential that we should *understand* Nazism. Is there anything in it that is good, even if a twisted and tortured good? What is the ambition behind it? the mentality it embodies? What does Germany wish? Even if she can never get it, even if we have to make sure she cannot get it, it is urgently necessary that we should know it. If the world is to come to a stable condition and if the peace is to be a permanent one, we must get into the skin of Nazism, and sit where the German sits. We cannot destroy a people of eighty millions. That would be an easy solution. We might try to convert them. That would be much harder, though we may hope for such a blessed consummation in time. But meantime we must use our Christian imagination to penetrate the dark secret of the evil system we are fighting. We shall live with Germany, if not happily at least decently, if we can grasp her point of view. Apart from the Nazi embodiment of it, there is something in Totalitarianism that appeals to certain types. What is it? Can it be satisfied in any other way? I am asking questions; and that is what I suggest we should do. If I were a German, what fundamentally would I be wanting? And can this be met in any worthy Christian arrangement that would bring the nations together?

5. And, finally, let us note and take to heart the fact that this truth is the very essence of the gospel. It is the meaning of the Incarnation and the Cross. Jesus came into our lot and sat where we sit. It is this that has made Him our Redeemer.

> In ev'ry pang that rends the heart,
> The Man of sorrows had a part.

We owe our redemption to the loving imagination of the Son of God. It is because He took our nature that He can be called the Son of Man. And because He knows us from the inside, because we have not an High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities but was in all points tried like ourselves, that He

> Pursues in heav'n his mighty plan,
> The Saviour and the friend of man.

Shall we who owe everything to this heavenly imagination be unready to use our imagination to help our brethren by sitting where they sit?

A Section of the Gospel.

The Gospel according to St. Luke xiv. 7–33.

By the Reverend Edward Shillito, M.A., B.A., Buckhurst Hill, Essex.

No one can set out to study a section of the Gospel without adopting, if only as a working hypothesis, some general method of interpreting the history of Jesus. 'The meaning of the life of Jesus is not a thing added by an interpreter, at a later date, to an already existing naked historical narrative or reminiscence; a thing which can be detached or removed by the critic in order that he may recover the naked events, and clothe them, maybe, with some other interpretation of his own. The meaning of the history of Jesus precedes and conditions its occurrence' (Edwyn Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, i. 121). Those, therefore, who believe that in the earthly life of Jesus the soul is confronted in judgment and in mercy by the Living God can separate a section of the story without any fear of making excursions down blind alleys. They will keep their minds upon two panels at the same time. These scattered, fragmentary sayings and doings of Jesus can be safely studied in sections only if they are seen related to His judgment and His redemption.

At first sight this section consists of a number of sayings, parabolic and cautionary, set forth in pictures taken not from lilies and ravens and the countryside, but from the social life of a community. It may even look as if several of the subjects were grouped together because of their common reference to feasts and the behaviour of guests. Just as Boswell in his recollections of Dr. Johnson sometimes groups together the sayings of the sage, which have some such common link, so the Evangelist finds it useful to have such a sequence as this. The subjects may be briefly and barely described.

1. Counsel to those who choose out the chief rooms at a wedding feast (vv.[7-11]).
2. Prescription for those who seek a really blessed feast (vv.[12-14]).
3. Warning to those who are bidden to the feast: in spite of their words they may not want to go (vv.[15-20]).
4. Others will take their place, the halt, the maimed, the blind (vv.[21-25]).
5. The Kingdom may be likened to a feast; but that is not the first thing to be known about it. It is the bearing of a cross. Better that men should count the cost before entering upon this journey (vv. [25-33]).

It is a section upon good manners but it is also upon judgment. It reads at first as if it were an addition to the Book of Proverbs. On the face of it, the story of the 'climber' who was taken down would fit well with the wisdom of the Jews. And the story of the angry householder who gathered for his feast the blind and the halt would have delighted those Wise Men with their quick eye for the judgment which is visited upon fools. Our Lord was familiar with that section of the Old Testament in which wisdom is exalted, and folly judged. He knows not only the sights of the countryside but the streets and houses of the city. Not without a touch of the humour with which the Wise Men looked upon the ways of human beings in society, our Lord deals with the customs to be observed in Capernaum. The man who pushed himself forward; the man whose guests found many excuses to disguise their evident distaste for the feast; the man who began to build and left his 'Folly' by which he was remembered, 'he began to build and could not finish'; the vain princeling who thought he could overcome a mightier king and had to make terms. These are figures which might have been found in the books of Wisdom. But there is a difference when it is recalled how in all such teaching as this, behind it and within it, there is a new revelation breaking into human life. In the language of ordinary daily affairs, blended with maxims which teach good manners, there is pressing upon human hearts a revelation which is also a judgment in the presence of which the soul is in the hands of God.

But this can only be understood if such teaching is seen in the light of the Christian gospel in its entirety. By itself much of this teaching is seen to be concerned with decent behaviour. People should not push their way at wedding feasts; they should not enter the weary round of a social circle in which they are always meeting the same people or they would not be asked in return ('we must ask the So-and-so's'); they must have some sense of

decency and proportion when they are dealing with invitations; if they do not want to go, they ought not to make idle excuses, and they ought not to pretend that they would really be delighted to go if they were only free. Moreover, they ought to reckon up the costs before they enter upon any enterprise.

But throughout there is assumed, and in the latter part of the section this is definitely expressed, that in the Kingdom of God there is a new fact which cannot be expressed in the language of customary social life which rests upon other assumptions. It is an altogether new fact, which can only be studied by a deliberate ironic choice of pictures, which belong to another order altogether. This order would be turned topsy-turvy by this strange wild love which is now released.

What could there be in common between such a wedding feast as this in the parable, and the Kingdom of God? For the matter of that, what likeness is there between the policy of an astute man who seeks the lowest place, but all the time covets the same honour as the man who pushes himself into the chief place? That looks like a subtle maxim uttered by Mr. Worldly Wiseman. There is a deliberate use here of the method of teaching which Jesus used in the Parable of the Unjust Judge and elsewhere. The hearers who could enter into His mind and had ears to hear would know what His picture meant. The Kingdom would indeed be a feast, but not like that. Those who sought chief places would need to be asked, as the sons of Zebedee were asked, whether they could drink of the cup that He drank of; that Heavenly Feast which was opened to men would not be one in which there was anything at all like the honours of the feast which He described. The one point in common is found in the reversal of parts, a very trifling thing in a wedding feast in which it meant only a discomfiture for some guests, but a serious matter in the Kingdom of God. There was now introduced a revolution with which men would have to reckon. The high would be brought low; the low exalted. But the new Kingdom would look like madness, when it was observed, as mad as that feast in which a complete rearrangement was made. In each case there is a reversal. First are last, last first.

The story of the new kind of feast (vv.[12-14]) carries within it the same claim for the love which is also the wrath of God, now revealed and released in His Kingdom. Love such as this is a reckless thing. It does not reckon in terms of prudence. It does not take its character from the worth of the one who is loved. Certainly it has nothing whatever to do with the love, which is limited to the people 'one can know.' Since it is kindled at the fires of the Divine Love, it must have some of the same generosity, and carelessness.

> Love to the loveless shown
> That they might lovely be.

This love is not described in such a Parable as this, but it lies behind all the words of Jesus and gives each its place in the whole Gospel. Here is a picture of a man clean mad by the standards of conventional society. Men do not do such things. It is precisely here that the significance of the story is to be found. Christian love has this at least in common with the mind of this odd householder; it is not 'reasonable,' it is incalculable, and this because it has within it the creative redeeming power of God. It is in the oddness and the absurdity of this Feast judged by the standards of men that the significance of the picture is found.

The Master is still speaking (vv.[15-20]) in the language of social life. 'How blessed to eat bread in the kingdom of God,' one of His hearers cried. It is to be assumed that this was a conventional pious ejaculation. A man may sincerely cry 'Hallelujah!' when he hears the Gospel invitation or he may cry it without meaning anything at all. Jesus wishes to warn His hearers that it is possible for them to be outside the heavenly feast, simply because they do not want it, and although all the time they were singing their aspirations for it. Pliable, it is noted, was particularly entranced by the account of the Celestial City and wanted to quicken the pace; but he did not really desire to enter into it, and this was discovered when he came to the Slough of Despond. The stress of the present story is laid upon the reluctance of the men invited to come to the feast. They simply did not want to go. There is once more the same note of judgment revealed here. The new Kingdom will be offered to men, and to some it will not be good news at all; they will make excuses. And once more the mad revolution is described; the householder fills the place with the halt and the maimed and the blind. The thing for which the Master prepares His hearers is the revolutions which lie sleeping in this new thing.

It is one of the most tragic misuses of Scripture that a phrase out of this Parable, 'compel them to come in,' has been used many times to defend the use of the purely worldly powers to correct Jews

and heretics. A parable which, if it teaches anything, teaches the entrance into human affairs of a new strange power, is made a defence of the weapons of the flesh! The language of the heavenly kingdom is used to defend the ways of the kingdoms of this earth!

But before this section ends we hear some of the truths, which have all the time been hidden and been unexpressed. It is as if the Master has left the feast theme. The disciple would have indeed

> The shout of them that triumph,
> The song of them that feast,'

but it is more necessary for him to think of the way in which he must go with a halter about his neck. The new relationship which is offered to him is not one among other relationships, the network of which makes the pattern of social life. On the contrary, this love which is to be his cannot be put side by side with other loves. It is by itself, and can have no rival or even companion. This must be expressed forcibly, even violently, so that there shall be no room for mistake. The disciple must be prepared to regard the new order as not a reformed and rearranged life; it is on another level altogether. 'If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also he cannot be my disciple.'

The hyperbole was needed. It sounds hard, and it can be perverted to wrong uses. But it was bound to be hard to do justice to the tremendous new reality which was offered in the Gospel to the disciple. Here the whole truth is not given. It is not told here, but it is elsewhere, that this 'hatred' is the way to a new love of father and mother; and that this taking up of a cross is the way to a new enjoyment of human life, and to forsake all things is the only way to possess all things. Here it is the strangeness of the Love which is released in the Kingdom that is made known. It is Love in judgment; Love that sharply separates, that it may at last reunite in the glory of the Heavenly Kingdom.

In the letters of David Livingstone, published last year,[1] there is a passage which may well give rise to some criticism of methods in the mission field, but at the heart of it, it gives an example of what this primacy of the Love of Christ means. Livingstone writes on the eve of a long journey in 1851:

> 'But we have an immense region before us; thousands live and die without God and without hope though the command went forth of old: Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. It is a venture to take wife and children into a country where fever—African fever—prevails. But who that believes in Jesus would refuse to make a venture for such a Captain. A parent's heart alone can feel as I do when I look at my little ones and ask, Shall I return with this or that one alive? However, we are His and wish to have no interests apart from those of His kingdom and glory.'

This man did understand the words of the Master in His demand for the only place which the love of Him could take.

No one can read such a section or any section of the Gospels without being compelled to say whether as he reads he is or is not in touch with a visitation from another world than this; whether God hath visited and redeemed His people; whether, indeed, there is One who here lays His hand upon us in His love, which is always His judgment. Are we dealing with one, perhaps the highest hitherto known, variation of human wisdom and goodness? Or is there here, breaking through into this human soul in the new kingdom, the powers of the age to come? Must we read here, what is not written here, but is everywhere presupposed? Are we to listen in it for the good news of a love which is so new and so incalculable that it can only be expressed in paradox and hyperbole, and indeed in terms of a human society which by its own standards goes mad?

These questions are forced upon us and much depends upon our answer.

[1] Oxford University Press, edited by David Chamberlin.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THE University of Riga is or was an ancient and well-organized seat of learning, but apparently the theological faculty is comparatively modern. This volume of studies[1] has been prepared in honour of Dr. Waldemar Maldons, on his seventieth birthday (6th July 1940), by colleagues and pupils who are grateful to him for initiating the study of theology in the University. Naturally some of the papers are of either local or general interest, especially the first two and the last four, but the five central essays appeal to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Professor Lindblom of Lund (pp. 65–77) discusses the meaning of Job 19^{25-27} in a short, fresh paper. Job has been playing with the thought of having evidence for his innocence put into such a permanent form, 'inscribed in a book,' that after-ages will do him tardy justice. Now he turns to a far more vital hope, to the personal witness of the Almighty on his behalf. 'But I know that my vindicator lives.' Unlike most recent editors of the book Dr. Lindblom supports the idea that we have here an anticipation of Job's restoration to health. In other words the declaration answers to the epilogue 'At last, on earth' (as in 41^{25}), God will cease to plague and persecute him ($13^{25f.}$) and arise to champion his cause effectively before the eyes of men, to the confusion of his censorious friends. 'When I shall see him' is held to mean a vision or rather an experience of God's goodness in the present life, as in Ps 11^{7} and 27^{13}. The interpretations which explain this outburst of confidence as an allusion to the cultus or to prophetic ecstasy or to a theophany are set aside. It is taken to mean not a post-mortem vindication but a description of the good man enjoying life free from pain and misunderstanding, life in its fullness under the favour of a God who is no longer estranged or hostile (19^{13}). The obscure terms in the middle of the cry refer to release from bodily suffering, not to any disembodied condition.

Dr. Felix Treu discusses (pp. 83–90) the question whether any traces of Iranian religion are to be found in the Second Isaiah, with special reference to von Gall's thesis that Parseeism formed a vital impetus to the further development of Hebrew religious thought at this period. Dr. Treu recognizes the difficulty of determining the extent of contemporary syncretism in relation to the prophets, but he allows that Iranian ideas lie behind the allusions to the North in 43, to the emphasis on the Lord's sway over all lands, and to the description of God as the First and the Last, where there appears to be a distinctly polemical attitude on the part of the prophet, or at any rate an assumption that the readers were familiar with Iranian predicates of the Deity. It is argued that while the historical Cyrus, whom Dr. Treu declines to eliminate from the text, was probably no champion of Iranian religion but merely interested in it as a statesman, nevertheless the Second Isaiah used him to represent characteristically Hebrew beliefs. In other words, the writer's conclusion is that the prophet availed himself of Iranian as well as Parsee conceptions now and then, in order to bring out the supreme monotheism which distinguished Israel's faith.

Dr. K. Kundsin (pp. 97–116) argues that primitive Christianity started with adherence not only to logia or sayings of the historical Jesus but to certain words of revelation which possess still a timeless power, words which brought out factors not understood during the earthly life of the Lord. Some are enshrined in records of the early kerugma. As in contemporary Hellenism and Judaism, so in early Christianity, there was a longing for numinous words which manifested divine authority, for prophetic sayings, for heavenly voices, and for self-revelations of the ascended Christ, particularly for 'I am' sayings. He finds the latter in Mt 28^{20}, Rev 1^{17} (with Lk 24^{39}, Jn 6^{21}) 22^{16} 21^{6}, Jn 14^{6} 11^{25} 6^{35} ('I am the bread of life'), 10^{11} ('I am the good Shepherd'), 15^{5} ('I am the vine'), Rev 3^{20}.

Dr. J. Resewski (pp. 117–134) pleads that in reproducing Mark both Matthew and Luke must have depended upon oral tradition more seriously than some scholars allow, and that their freedom in handling Mark cannot be explained by a mechanical application of the Two-source theory. There may have been other written sources unknown to us, as well as oral tradition.

Dr. Frantisek Zilka's paper (pp. 135–154) is an eschatologist's argument for the sovereign freedom with which early writers handled their inherited eschatological material in the light of Christ as the triumphant Messiah. The religious kernel was belief in the absolutely real God and his revelation, eschatology being the confident assertion of the divine victory over evil, which was expressed

[1] *Studia Theologica*, ii. (Riga, 1940).

symbolically and in a timeless form. He thus endeavours to trace a sequence between the synoptic view and a passage like the sixteenth chapter of the Fourth Gospel, and refuses to attempt any co-ordination of the various New Testament programmes of the end. The Church must believe in eschatology, but not in any scheme of Adventism, if it is to be true to the core of what the New Testament writers intended as they depicted the end in this or that pictorial form.

The other volume on our list is a Dutch monograph,[1] which covers both the Old and the New Testaments, though the New Testament receives less space (p. 108 f.) than is assigned to the Septuagint (1–117), rabbinic Judaism (118 f.), and apocalyptic Judaism (144 f.). One may admit candidly, to begin with, that the author's insight into the distinctive characteristics of early Christian faith is not always adequate; there is a tendency to rest satisfied with contemporary connotations of 'peace' in civic or ethical usage, till the very idea of inward peace of soul appears to be ruled out of the New Testament altogether, or at any rate to be depreciated in estimating Paul's references to peace. In this respect Dr. van Leeuwen's book is less rewarding than the composite article contributed six years ago to Kittel's *Theologische Wörterbuch*. Yet this treatise is far from being a compendium of grammatical and linguistic research. It displays astonishing width of reading, delicate judgment, and distinct power of interpretation. One finds in its pages a constant challenge to conventional ideas of the subject.

There is a grim irony in such a book being printed at the present moment by a Dutch scholar. He is no propagandist, but even in analysing the remote data with which he is concerned he is able to make some apposite comments, which frequently cut the ground from under sentimental pacifism. One point which is repeatedly made is that peace is not for the Bible the antithesis of war or conflict; it is the result of war, waged by the Lord against the powers of evil in any shape or form. The opposite of peace is the temper which commits or condones breaches of justice and freedom on earth. In other words, peace is, at its deepest core, the outcome of God's victory over oppressors, and cannot be enjoyed except by those who accept that victory or share in it, as it is waged against evil incarnate or supernatural powers of malice embodied in human form. This is not a new idea. But the author offers new light upon it. Thus, as he indicates (66 f.), for example, the context of the famous Isaianic passage upon the 'prince of peace' reveals that peace here is not a pacific method but the state of bliss and welfare which is won by the divine champion of truth and justice. Such a view is traced brilliantly through the apocalyptic period of Judaism, which is so important for the rise of primitive Christianity. There can be no peace for any who resist or ignore God. This, Dr. van Leeuwen maintains, is essential to the faith of the Bible, whatever be the historical situation. 'Grace and peace' is a phrase which shows what the prevailing grace of God, and that alone, obtains for those who yield to His redemption from Satan. The author renders Lk 2^{14} in triple fashion, 'May there be glory to God in the height, peace on earth, and among men divine favour,' the divine favour being divine grace triumphant, and the peace meaning anything but international amity.

Few words in Hebrew, Greek, or English are more vague than 'peace.' The Greek term was merely one of several employed by the Septuagint to render the Hebrew 'shalom' in its broad variety of prosperity, welfare, fellowship, security, recovery of health, and so forth. Dr. van Leeuwen's pages are an invaluable guide to the intricate contents and associations of the term, as it emerged through the centuries which he covers. He closes by emphasizing the dynamic quality of 'peace' in the New Testament; to be at peace is far more than to refrain from quarrelling; though that belongs to its range, it is the outcome of a divine challenge to evil which is triumphant through Christ. Peace is the fruit of the Spirit in the Community redeemed by the Lord, not a smiling, affable, pacific temper, which dislikes moral indignation. Dr. van Leeuwen, as has been already hinted, does not always see this where it has been seen, but he is alive to its importance as he draws to the end of his learned and masterly analysis. As he somewhere puts it, peace must be primarily interpreted in its dogmatic significance before it can be truly understood in the realm of Christian ethics.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

[1] *Eirene in Het Nieuwe Testament*, eene een semasiologische, exegetische bijdrage op grond van de Septuaginta en de joodsche Literatur, by Dr. W. S. van Leeuwen (H. Veenman en Zonen, Wegeningen, 1940; pp. 232).

Contributions and Comments.

St. Mark x. 36.

In my study of this text in the May 1941 number of The Expository Times, p. 317 f., Θ should be read in the third line instead of D.

Bruce, in his quoted reference to the text, is mistaken in regarding D as preserving the same reading as C.

A. J. B. Higgins.

Lancashire Independent College, Manchester.

St. Mark x. 51.

ἵνα ἀναβλέψω.

The use of ἵνα *c.* subjunctive (in the second and third person) to express a command is an established usage in Hellenistic Greek (=νά *c.* subj. in Modern Greek; cf. Thumb, *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*, 127). See Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 178 f. for papyri and New Testament examples (Mk 5^{23}, Eph 5^{33}, etc.). For the LXX add 2 Macc 1^{9}. The same use with the *first* person is rare, but apparently occurs in

BGUI, 48^{18} (ii/iii A.D.): ἐὰν ἀναβῇς τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα (cited in Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 305a).

Epictetus III. iv. 9: ἄγε ἵνα Σώφρων στεφανωθῇ . . . ἄγε ἵνα τηρήσω τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ προαίρεσιν, 'Come let Sophron be crowned. . . . Come let me preserve my choice' (cited in D. S. Sharp, *Epictetus and the New Testament*, 96 f.).

Three New Testament passages *may* illustrate this use of ἵνα:

Mk 12^{15}: This is uncertain, since ἵνα may have the classical (purposive) sense, 'so that I may see it,' as most translators render. Moffatt and Torrey, however, apparently take the ἵνα clause as virtually independent, and render 'let me see it.'

Mk 10^{51} (=Lk 18^{41}): Here the usual view is that the ἵνα clause presupposes θέλω (answering to θέλεις), and defines the content of the wish, being equivalent to a simple infinitive (cf. Mk 10^{43-44}). Thus most translators:

'That I may receive my sight' (R.V.).
'I want to regain my sight' (Moffatt).
'I would see!' (Torrey).

But others apparently find an imperatival sense:

'Let me recover my sight' (Weymouth).
'Let our eyes be opened' (Mt 20^{33}).
'Let me regain my sight' (Goodspeed).
'Have our eyes opened!' (Mt 20^{33}).

Robertson (on Lk 18^{41}) says 'either after θέλω understood or as a hortatory command.' But his translation favours the latter alternative: 'let me see again.'

If we presume the ellipsis of (*a*) εἰπέ or εἰπόν, the command is explicit (cf. Mt 20^{21}; also 4^{3}, and Lk 10^{40}), or (*b*) θέλω, the imperatival meaning is approached. θέλω ἵνα may have a quasi-imperatival sense, just as in colloquial English 'I want to see it' approximates to 'let me see it.' It is instructive that for Mark's θέλω ἵνα . . . δῷς (6^{25}) Matthew has δός μοι (14^{8}). On either theory therefore the stronger (imperatival) rendering of Mk 10^{51} (Lk 18^{41}) seems to be justified. It is perhaps preferable, since the absence of any governing verb brings the use of ἵνα *c.* the first person into line with the second and third person usages cited above.

H. G. Meecham.

Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.

Entre Nous.

'Roman Fountain.'

On the 1st of June Sir Hugh Walpole, that prince of story-tellers and kindliest of critics, died at the early age of fifty-seven. He died without writing his autobiography, and so we return to that fragment of an autobiography that he has left—*Roman Fountain*—and which has been too little noticed. 'But this is not an autobiography,' he said. 'No, no. It will be twenty years before I write one.' So he wrote in August 1939, just after he had come back from Rome. The immediate cause of his journey was to record the funeral of Pope Pius XI., the election of the new Pope, and his coronation. While *Roman Fountain* is an account of all this, it is more truly his attempt to answer the question that everything in Rome

drove him to ask, 'But what does it mean?' As one of the Herries did, 'he looks for facts and things behind the fact.' And so he placed as a motto to his book 'the casual impertinent words of Wystan Auden:

It's no use raising a shout,
No, Honey, you can cut that right out.
I don't want any more hugs;
Make me some fresh tea, fetch me some rugs.
Here am I, here are you;
But what does it mean? What are we going to do?

Here am I, here are you:
But what does it mean? What are we going to do?'

This is a book without a plot, but with the incidents connected together by Walpole's effort to find again the Fountain, which he had come upon at an earlier visit to Rome. It was one afternoon in March 1909 that he first saw it. To him it exceeded all fountains in beauty.

'The Fountain represented a Triton blowing his horn, and two children, each holding a fish. The figures, exquisitely carved, were of blue-grey bronze. The Triton, although his features were blurred by time, expressed magnificent joy and confidence. He seemed to be summoning with his horn all the company of gallant and triumphant men there were in the world. The carving of his back and loins was so vigorous that he appeared to be about to leap from the Fountain and stride from one end of the city to the other. The children also in their beautiful symmetry of limb and gesture expressed the climax of joy and energy. It was as though the three of them had at that moment heard news so excellent that they were transported out of themselves and could scarcely control their ecstasy. The waters of the Fountain leaped into the air as the waters of the Roman fountains so exultantly do.'

It does not seem to matter that at his visit in 1939 in spite of much searching he could not find the Fountain again. 'No, I didn't, during those ten days, physically look for the Fountain at all. I was expecting some climax, some discovery. . . . I hoped that I was to have, like Saul on the road to Damascus, a revelation.' There came to him, as he wrote in *Affirmations: My Religious Experience*, an awareness, 'not by my own will, almost against my will, of an existence in another life, of far greater importance and beauty than this physical one, beautiful and important though that is.'

'This book,' he wrote, 'is an honest record of the moments when the writer, not a very spiritual man, perceived the strong, unchecked, rich, glorious undercurrent of the inner, outer, wider, fuller life of the spirit. *That* life immediate current history cannot terminate or destroy although it may influence it.

'I do not know how it may be with the world six months or a year from now when this book is published, but I *do* know that the inner life of man will be continuing, richly, rewardingly, often joyfully, as it has always continued, even though London is in ruins and we are living, most of us, on acorns in stout underground cages. I, at this tiresome moment when proud history has seen fit to have its nose tweaked by an Austrian house-painter, confidently salute the future!'

He had learned that 'the soul of man was immortal and it was good to be joyful.

'Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all my heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

'It was no revelation that came to me. Something very much simpler. I knew that for myself this was the law of the world and the explanation of all things. I could not say what it would be for any one else, and I was not at all blind as to how often I should myself fail in it—yes, again and again and again. But I knew an impulse of great happiness. Whatever might come, I had seen clearly what was the truth of things for me.'

The Christian Standpoint.

'To many of us the Christian position has been clear for some time. While war is an unholy thing, there are situations where it is much the lesser of two evils. To allow ruthless and brutal tyranny to violate justice and to enslave free nations cannot be the will of God. We acknowledge that the plight in which we find ourselves is God's judgment upon us for our failure to accept and discharge our responsibility for the maintenance of righteous order. We must keep before our eyes a more Christian social order, both within our frontiers and in the world, which shall include those peoples who are now being led by their rulers against us. The more clearly this international order can be set forth by your and our leaders in Church and State, the more wholeheartedly we can fling our energies into its achievement and the more appealing it can be made to people now deceived by false ambitions

of domination. We must not seek God's blessing on an Anglo-Saxon ruled future. We have to guard against the pride we dislike in others. We must constantly bring all our thoughts under the searching scrutiny of Christ.

'Your courage and endurance and steadfast faith compel our admiration and our hearts are with you in all that is being inflicted on you. We are (in the words of Lincoln) highly resolving to stand by you to see that liberty shall not perish from the earth. We trust that the God of righteousness, after He has disciplined us, may use us for His purpose—a purpose which we know includes the good of those who at the moment seem our foes, as well as of you, our comrades in the cause of freedom.'[1]

A Free Man.

'He (Rendel Harris) was a free man, for he knew the glorious liberty of the children of God. He told me that when he was at Cambridge he entered into a deep experience of evangelical freedom. At that time he was an undergraduate living out of College; his landlady's boy coming in to see him, Rendel Harris said to him, "How old are you?" The little boy with a lisp answered, "I am f-three." Rendel Harris replied, "Thank the Lord I am *free* too." He never lost what he found then. Some little time before his death he said to me, "I have a growing familiarity with the geography of the banks of this side Jordan." Now he knows the land on the other side. We may quote of him the words which he so fervently loved, "So he passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side." When he passed over he was in his ninetieth year. His "removal" (to use his own word about the death of a friend) tells of a long life nobly lived, and of a triumphal entry into the company of the saints. At his funeral service I recalled the words which he had spoken at the funeral of a child in the same cemetery, "Your child is not here; this is the emptiest place in Birmingham." There was but a short space betwixt him and heaven. I remember his coming late to a class and saying, "I am sorry to be late, but I have just been to see a dear friend off." In my ignorance I said, "Have you been to the station?" He replied, "No, I have just come from a bedside where I saw a friend off to heaven." We love his beautiful remark, "Never worry about the way to heaven. Always remember it is a personally conducted tour." He once said, "When I die, do not sing 'Now the labourer's task is o'er.' Give me a few minutes, and I shall be fresh once again."'[2]

[1] President Henry S. Coffin, in *Life and Work*, June 1941.

The Colour Bar.

A feeling of strong indignation and disquiet was roused by the treatment of Sir Hari Singh, who was refused accommodation at a London hotel. It will be remembered that Sir Hari Singh was first Vice-Chancellor of Delhi University. Although when the question was raised in Parliament the Home Secretary expressed his disapproval of the action he went no further than to explain that he had no power in the matter. The subject is brought before us again this month, not this time in the Capital of the Empire but in East Africa. Dr. Norman Leys, in a book which he has just published through the Hogarth Press (*The Colour Bar in East Africa*), brings to light great injustices to natives, and forces us to look at some very ugly facts in the light of our doctrine of racial equality. A special point which he makes is that it is not social prejudices here but British Laws that are at the bottom of the mischief. It is the Law relating to land and taxation and labour which is keeping the people of the land under the domination of Europeans. Dr. Leys reminds us that colour bars are not found in French, Portuguese, or Belgian, but only in British Africa.

Surely one of our earliest reconstruction tasks must be the removal within the Commonwealth of racial discrimination.

Slavery in Abyssinia.

In the *Contemporary Review* Lord Noel Buxton writes: 'The Italians during their brief rule announced the abolition of slavery, perhaps because Italy had ratified the Slavery Convention and the Forced Labour Convention of the League of Nations. It would be tragic indeed if the country were to lose one of the few benefits conferred upon it by a foreign tyranny. The little good among so much evil ought to be preserved, and it is here that we must be prepared to give all the help that we can. There is a definite danger of a return to the old régime.

'To take the matter of slavery alone, a former owner whose slave had become free might find it possible to recapture him. We should ensure the provision of land settlements and training centres for liberated slaves, the building of schools, the extension of the existing roads, and a service of

[2] Principal W. Bardsley Brash in *The Congregational Quarterly*, June, 1941.

officials and police whose salaries would actually be paid.'

Prayer and Miracle.

The speech by the Archbishop of York after Dunkirk on prayer and miracle is still being incorrectly quoted, so we give a summary, prepared by the Archbishop himself and published in the July *Congregational Quarterly*.

'(1) We should recognize in the deliverance from Dunkirk an answer to our prayers; but (2) we must at all costs avoid the notion of prayer as another force, on the level of armaments, etc., which enters into combination with them and produces particular results which would not otherwise have occurred; also (3) the first thing that happened after the Day of Prayer was the defection of the Belgian King! Further, (4) the normal sphere of divine action is in men's hearts and wills, and we should seek it rather in the discipline of our men on the beaches, and the spirit of service in the boats, rather than in the weather, though (5) it is not to be denied that God could work miracles if the occasion seemed to Him sufficient. (6) Prayer leads to results in three ways: (i) it lifts us to a new level with new perspectives, and, when complete, to the realization that "*all* things work together for good to them that love God"—so that we should thank God "for all things," but especially, of course, recognize Him as the source of what we see to be good; (ii) it enables us to serve better—more bravely, etc.; (iii) it qualifies us to receive boons which could not be given without it, because it is (when real) the guarantee that they will be used to God's glory.'

'Unbelievable Arrogance.'

In her new book, *Looking for Trouble*, the American journalist, Miss Virginia Cowles, gives a remarkable account of her travels in Spain during the civil war, then of a visit to Soviet Russia, and to Libya where she interviewed Balbo, besides visits to Berlin and Prague. We find here many revealing characteristics of the celebrities she meets on her journeys. Here is a story, for example, of Ciano when he had visited Hitler at Berchtesgaden.

'Although I was longing to find out what had taken place at Berchtesgaden (the conversation was still a matter of the greatest secrecy) I didn't raise the subject, hoping that Italian indiscretion would give me an inkling of what had happened. Ciano guessed what was in my mind, for after lunch he took me for a motor-boat ride—one of the most uncomfortable rides I have ever had—and when we got about a mile from the shore dived off the boat and went swimming. Suddenly he bobbed up from under the water, his hair dripping over his eyes, and said: "I bet you'd like to know what I talked to Hitler about."

"Yes, I would. But perhaps because I have a shrewd opinion *he* did most of the talking."

"Well, don't be too sure," replied Ciano, irritated. "He is not the only one. I can make history too. When I think how many lives depend on my thoughts, it's a relief to come out for a few hours and get away from it all." (You may not believe it, but that's what he said.)'

Men and Women Complementary.

In her latest book, *Everyman's Affair*, Miss A. Ruth Fry writes: 'Our World Council and its very many subsidiary councils must not be merely masculine in membership. . . . Men and women are complementary, and the experience of my own religious body, the Society of Friends, where men and women take a completely equal part, confirms my belief that this is essential to the best work being done. I can hardly think that women, with their minds long initiated in the intricacies of housekeeping and home-making, would be capable of some of the egregious follies of military mismanagement.

"For instance, I should like to propose for some important position Mrs. Hortense Odlum, who recently resigned her post as president of a great department store in New York after six years' service. In this time she raised the annual volume of sales from 3½ million dollars to more than 10 million. Then, to every one's amazement, she retired.

'She was not interested, she said, in making money, but merely in experimenting as to the validity of her principles. These principles were kindliness, consideration for customers and employees alike, courtesy and appreciation. These qualities, she believed, together with good merchandise, would create a store where women would like to shop.

'. . . Would it not be worth while to invite Mrs. Odlum to try out her theories on the World Council?'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.